DOCUMENT RESUME

ED 030 724 VT 008 592

By-Czarnecki, Edgar R.
Manpower Developments: Problems and Prospects. Conference Series No. 12.
Iowa Univ., Iowa City. Center for Labor and Management.
Pub Date Oct 68
Note-88p.
Available from-Center for Labor and Management, College of Business Administration, University of Iowa, Phillips Hall, Iowa City, Iowa 52240 ($1.00)
EDRS Price MF-$0.50 HC-$4.50
Descriptors-Administrative Policy, Area Vocational Schools, Community Involvement, *Community Role, *Conference Reports, Disadvantaged Groups, Employer Employee Relationship, Federal Programs, *Federal State Relationship, *Industrial Relations, Labor Supply, Labor Unions, *Manpower Development, Manpower Needs, Minority Groups
Identifiers-Labor Management Conference

The theme of this conference was the full utilization of human resources. "The Federal Government's Impact on Manpower Training," by Stanley Ruttenberg focused on the interaction of federal, state, and local systems of government with community action agencies, manpower committees, and councils in providing increased job opportunities. "An Assessment of Iowa Manpower," by Harold E. Hughes stressed the fact that we have fallen short in one major area, namely, matching men and jobs. These two speeches are presented in full, together with papers presented at five concurrent workshops which were designed to provide stimulating areas for concentrated attention on the resolution of difficulties in recruiting, hiring, promoting, and retiring workforce participants. Recommendations include: (1) Management, unions, and government must work together for the resolution of our social needs, (2) Management needs a specific program for each level of skill, (3) The status of the skilled worker must be elevated, (4) The image of government service must be improved, and (5) We need a firm commitment for vocational education for those students who do not graduate from college. (CH)

ED0 30724

C1

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

DO NOT FILM THIS PAGE

Manpower Developments: Problems and Prospects

Center for Labor and Management

October, 1968

College of Business Administration
The University of Iowa
Iowa City, Iowa

VT008522

ED 030724

THIS DOCUMENT HAS BEEN REPRODUCED EXACTLY AS RECEIVED FROM THE PERSON OR ORGANIZATION ORIGINATING IT. POINTS OF VIEW OR OPINIONS STATED DO NOT NECESSARILY REPRESENT OFFICIAL OFFICE OF EDUCATION POSITION OR POLICY.

U.S. DEPARTMENT OF HEALTH, EDUCATION & WELFARE
OFFICE OF EDUCATION

MANPOWER DEVELOPMENTS:

PROBLEMS AND PROSPECTS

by

Edgar R. Czarnecki

Conference Series No. 12 **October, 1968**

Iowa Univ., Iowa City.

Center for Labor and Management
College of Business Administration
The University of Iowa, Iowa City, Iowa

FOREWORD

The Twelfth Annual Labor-Management Conference was held on Wednesday, April 17, 1968, at The University of Iowa in Iowa City. With the growing role and interest of the business and labor community in the manpower policies and programs of state and federal agencies, the theme, "Manpower Development: Problems and Prospects," was timely and appropriate. My colleagues and I were pleased and honored to be able to present to those attending this conference the thinking of some of the key men at both the state and national levels who are involved in resolving some of the major manpower problems facing our country.

The conference, keynoted by Governor Harold E. Hughes and Assistant Secretary of Labor Stanley Ruttenberg, was both provocative and informative. The general topic and subissues were expectedly controversial. The Center for Labor and Management is indebted to the two keynoters and to the staff of practicing professionals who participated in panel discussions on a variety of subjects ranging from labor and management responsibilities to the role of area schools and federal programs.

We wish to thank Professor Edgar Czarnecki of the Center staff who was responsible for the development and initiation of this conference as well as for the editing of the proceedings. Also his secretary, Mrs. Mona Lepic, spent many hours editing and typing the final manuscript. Finally, a special word of appreciation is given to Deere and Company, Hoerner Foundation, Maytag Foundation, Iowa Federation of Labor, AFL-CIO, and those other groups whose continued interest and financial support of the Center's research and publication program has made the printing of these proceedings possible.

Don R. Sheriff
Professor and Director
Center for Labor and Management
The University of Iowa

TABLE OF CONTENTS

FOREWORD iii
CONTRIBUTORS v
INTRODUCTION, Edgar R. Czarnecki, Assistant Professor and Program Director, Center for Labor and Management, The University of Iowa 1
AN ASSESSMENT OF IOWA MANPOWER, Harold E. Hughes, Governor, State of Iowa 6
THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S IMPACT ON MANPOWER TRAINING, Stanley Ruttenberg, Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Manpower Administrator, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C. 11
  Remarks—Stanley Ruttenberg and Edgar R. Czarnecki 17
WORKSHOPS 25
  1. Contractual Relations: Their Effect Upon Employee Training and Upgrading 25
    Remarks—Harry E. Graham, Assistant Professor and Program Director, Center for Labor and Management, The University of Iowa 25
    Papers—Rudy Oswald, Department of Research, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C. 28
    Don E. Hock, Corporate Director of Industrial Relations, J. I. Case Company, Racine, Wisconsin 33
  2. The Effect of Labor and Management Policies on the Supply of Skilled Workers 37
    Remarks—Anthony V. Sinicropi, Associate Professor and Associate Director, Center for Labor and Management, The University of Iowa 39
    Papers—Frank G. Werden, Director, Midwestern Region, National Electrical Contractors Association, St. Paul, Minn. 39
    Reese Hammond, Education Director, International Union of Operating Engineers, Washington, D.C. 43
  3. Manpower Problems in Public Employment 45
    Remarks—Thomas P. Gilroy, Program Director, The Center for Labor and Management, The University of Iowa 45
    Papers—Gerald Howell, Director, Iowa Merit Employment System, Des Moines, Iowa 48
    Hervey A. Juris, Assistant Professor of Labor Education, School for Workers, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin 51
    Donald Wasserman, Director of Education, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Washington, D.C. 58
  4. Labor and Management Responsibilities for the Employment of the Disadvantaged and Minority Groups 64
  Remarks—Irving Kovarsky, Professor, Department of Business Administration, College of Business Administration, The University of Iowa 64

Papers—Charles W. Toney, Management Development,
Deere and Company, Moline, Illinois 66
Robert McGlotten, Civil Rights Department, AFL-CIO,
Washington, D.C. 69
5. Area Schools and Federal Programs 72
Remarks—Duane Thompson, Program Director, Center for Labor
and Management, The University of Iowa 72
Papers—Windol Wyatt, Director, Division of Vocational Education,
Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa 74
John Ropes, Director, Iowa State Manpower Commission,
Des Moines, Iowa 77

CONTRIBUTORS*

Edgar R. Czarnecki, Assistant Professor and Program Director, Center for Labor and Management, The University of Iowa

Harold E. Hughes, Governor, State of Iowa

Stanley Ruttenberg, Assistant Secretary for Manpower and Manpower Administrator, U.S. Department of Labor, Washington, D.C.

Harry E. Graham, Assistant Professor and Program Director, Center for Labor and Management, The University of Iowa

Rudy Oswald, Department of Research, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

Don E. Hock, Corporate Director of Industrial Relations, J. I. Case Company, Racine, Wisconsin

Anthony V. Sinicropi, Associate Professor and Associate Director, Center for Labor and Management, The University of Iowa

Frank G. Werden, Director, Midwestern Region, National Electrical Contractors Association, St. Paul, Minnesota

Reese Hammond, Education Director, International Union of Operating Engineers, Washington, D.C.

Thomas P. Gilroy, Program Director, The Center for Labor and Management, The University of Iowa

Gerald Howell, Director, Iowa Merit Employment System, Des Moines, Iowa

Hervey A. Juris, Assistant Professor of Labor Education, School for Workers, The University of Wisconsin, Madison, Wisconsin

Donald Wasserman, Director of Education, American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees, Washington, D.C.

Irving Kovarsky, Professor, Department of Business Administration, College of Business Administration, The University of Iowa

Charles W. Toney, Management Development, Deere and Company, Moline, Illinois

Robert McGlotten, Civil Rights Department, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C.

Duane Thompson, Program Director, Center for Labor and Management, The University of Iowa

Windol Wyatt, Director, Division of Vocational Education, Department of Public Instruction, Des Moines, Iowa

John Ropes, Director, Iowa State Manpower Commission, Des Moines, Iowa

---

*Listed in order of appearance

INTRODUCTION

Edgar R. Czarnecki
Assistant Professor and Program Director
Center for Labor and Management
The University of Iowa

The Center for Labor and Management's annual labor-management conference is devoted to a theme in the "combat zone" of industrial relations, and our twelfth annual program did just that by focusing on how to fully utilize our human resources. Attention to manpower problems is a relatively new phenomenon extending over the past decade, although it is one that has received a substantial amount of attention in books, articles, and similar conferences throughout the United States.

Although we pride ourselves in this country on our respect for the human element in a highly industrialized society, we have suddenly found many people excluded from the benefits we have reaped and vast gaps in the quality and quantity of specific occupations. We have complacently felt that these two major problems will be met if only we could continue to expand our total job opportunities. This normal method of attack has still left people who are not fully participating in the benefits of our society and has done little to prevent specific manpower shortages. However, at least we have shifted our attention from production to people; we are now concerned with how we can meet the criticisms of large sectors of our population who, because of limited education and training, poor environment, and disrupted family life, cannot compete on an equal basis with those more generously endowed.

An appropriate setting for this conference is the state of Iowa, which, because of a population of under three million (smaller than many of our large metropolitan cities) must insure full development and participation of its workforce to meet (1) increased labor demand because of industrialization, and (2) a smooth transition from the decreasing rural areas to the increasing urban areas.

Complicating these labor shortages is the fact that the unemployment rate in Iowa has hovered around the 2 per cent level over the past decade and therefore is not a reserve that can be easily tapped. This acute shortage of manpower, particularly skilled, presents an extreme situation that has to be met by a comprehensive human resources program. This, after all, is the essence of all manpower programs.

To provide illustrations of what has been done and to suggest future remedies, this conference invited a group of practitioners to express their own ideas. These people were selected because: (1) they could directly relate to the work experience of the people attending the conference; (2) they could provide practical solutions to daily problems and not untried theoretical ideas; (3) working directly with manpower problems, they have discarded many of the stereotyped ideas that hinder experimentation in the manpower field; and (4) they represent a cross section of labor, management, and government and so, hopefully, will invoke a sense of cooperation among all these groups to resolve manpower problems by mutual action.

Given these reasons, we invited the Governor of Iowa, the Honorable Harold E. Hughes, to express his views on the state situation and explain what can be done to provide solutions to our cities' manpower problems. While Iowa does not have the metropolitan composition found in many of the northern industrial states, its cities have similar problems. The Governor of Iowa has exerted more leadership in this area than perhaps any other governor in our nation. He has constantly strived to provide gainful employment for all. For example, he formed a coordinating committee in seven cities in Iowa to plan summer job programs and explore school scheduling arrangements for teenage dropouts and potential dropouts long before they were inaugurated in other states. In 1967, for example, five Iowa cities raised $350,000 to employ one thousand youths working on public projects. In 1968 the Governor visited sixteen Iowa cities where he met with religious, civic, and educational leaders to plan coordinated programs to eliminate slums, provide education and job opportunities for all Iowa citizens.

In his talk the Governor stressed that manpower and employment problems hit at the very core of our social problems as they exist today. Iowa has been blessed with a large industrial expansion, and over the last five years Iowa has gained more than 115,000 jobs exclusive of agriculture and manufacturing. It has established a vocational school system that has focused on the problem of manpower development. Through these sixteen regional systems, innumerable programs have been provided to give young people educational capabilities to assist them in securing meaningful employment in our society. Unlike other states, Iowa has attacked the problem directly and has not blamed the federal system for its problems.

However, Governor Hughes stressed the fact that we have fallen short in one major area, namely matching men and jobs. On this point the Governor focused on the basic deficiencies of our present structure of federal-state employment security systems. In his estimation, we are still falling short of meeting new, difficult employment problems that have been assigned to us. We need, for example, to know more about the dropout situation. Here the Governor has instituted a policy of writing a personal letter to each high school dropout to determine why he has dropped out and to encourage his reentry into our educational system. But much more needs to be done. He concluded his talk with a plea that our employment system should be financially strengthened, modernized, and professionalized to the greatest possible extent. Our employment security systems need to be revitalized and strengthened if we are to meet the task before us.

After the talk by the Governor, the Conference was addressed by the Honorable Stanley H. Ruttenberg, Assistant Secretary and Manpower Administrator, United States Department of Labor. Mr. Ruttenberg is in charge of all the federal manpower programs and brings to this conference vast experience in the field and intensive knowledge of existing programs.

Mr. Ruttenberg focused on how to make the federal, state, and local systems of government work together with community action agencies, manpower committees and councils all over the country, to provide job opportunities for those who represent the ever-rising hopes and aspirations of America. Mr. Ruttenberg noted that we have to reassess our federal-state employment security system, modernize it, and bring it up to the level to attain the goals we have set forth. In his talk, he focused on four major manpower aspects: (1) coordination, (2) assisting the disadvantaged, (3) concentrated federal programs, and (4) the involvement of employers in the private sector of our economy. In this regard, he drew attention to the new CAMPS programs, the redirection of the Manpower Development and Training Program to involve a larger number of minorities, and the recently inaugurated Concentrated Employment Programs in key areas around the country.

Finally, he focused on the major program labeled JOBS, Job Opportunities in the Business Sector. This program is designed to get American employers to hire disadvantaged individuals. He concluded by stating that no one can help but be overwhelmed by the size and scope of the problem confronting us across this nation. He said we do not have all the answers, but we are moving in the right direction. His talk concisely explored what we have been doing and where we are headed.

Following Mr. Ruttenberg's talk there was a long and interesting question period in which Mr. Ruttenberg incorporated the following ideas:

1. We have to allocate our resources and give priorities to the disadvantaged—those with little income, often unemployed, victims of poor schooling, and excluded from many existing private training programs.

2. The government has assumed the major responsibility so far for providing not only specific training programs for specific occupations, but also providing basic work adjustment or orientation programs for minority groups.

3. Many unions and trade associations have done an excellent job by participating in existing programs.

4. The major weakness so far in our manpower program is the lack of total commitment to the eradication of all human resource problems; we have the tools—we need the determination of all concerned.

Following these two talks the afternoon sessions were devoted to five concurrent workshops. The format was brief presentations by the panelists on one specific area, and then questions were solicited from the participants. The attempt was to provide stimulating areas to concentrate attention on how the conference participants could resolve difficulties in recruiting, hiring, promoting, and retiring workforce participants. Following is a synopsis of the five workshops.

1. *Contractual Relations: Their Effect Upon Employee Training and Upgrading.*

This workshop was directed to industrial corporations and their unions to determine new approaches in this area and to analyze how both parties working together may solve some of the manpower problems facing us.

2. *The Effect of Labor and Management Policies on the Supply of Skilled Workers.*

This focused on the entire area of skill training, apprenticeship programs, and other areas relating to the most critical manpower area, namely, how to provide enough skilled workers for our industry and relate this pressing demand to current federal programs in the area.

3. *Manpower Problems in Public Employment.*

Concern here was with the most rapidly growing sector of our economy and one faced with a critical shortage of manpower. Schools, hospitals, and state agencies have the difficult problem of attracting people, retaining them and rewarding them as their jobs become more complicated and more pressures are exerted on labor in this area.

4. *Labor and Management Responsibilities for the Employment of the Disadvantaged and Minority Groups.*

What can be done to contact the disadvantaged? How can we train them? What modifications must be brought about to encourage the full utilization of the disadvantaged in our economy? These were the subjects discussed in this workshop.

5. *Area Schools and Federal Programs.*

This workshop discussed the role of vocational-technical institutions in the state and their role in cooperating with existing federal programs to meet some of our manpower problems.

The papers presented in the workshops are introduced in these Conference Proceedings by a short statement by the various workshop moderators. Some of the practical suggestions presented were:

1. Management in general needs not only a basic commitment to human resource development, but a specific program for each level of skill with complete evaluation of the results of such programs.
2. Industrial and construction unions are two different organizations with specific and distinct training problems and therefore cannot be treated collectively.
3. The status of the skilled worker must be elevated.
4. Skill shortages cannot be resolved by diluting the skills but only by maintaining and, in fact, increasing skill levels.
5. Perhaps the one most important element to secure adequate government personnel is to change and improve the image of governmental service.
6. Government must take a long look at needed reorganization and modernization programs to improve its personnel policies.
7. The above reorganization must be undertaken with the realization that unions in the public sector may in fact assist sound government personnel policies rather than hinder them.
8. The United States Employment Service needs a new image with the black community.
9. We need a firm commitment for vocational education for those students who do not graduate from college.
10. To reemphasize the point made by Secretary Ruttenberg, manpower problems will be resolved only by the realization that management, unions, and government must work together to solve our social needs.

If one might ask, "What were the major contributions of this conference?" the answers would be: (1) It exposed people to the immense difficulties created by our current manpower situation and provided them with some fresh ideas on how others engaged in the same problem area have met their responsibilities; (2) It concentrated the attention of the participants on workshops devoted to specific problems and thereby avoided the shortcomings of many conferences which merely discuss the general or overall situation; (3) It came up with some answers. Some answers were similar to those provided by others who looked into this situation, but the fact that these same answers were provided in our conference indicates that these programs were not fully implemented. Perhaps they were not even fully explored, or perhaps not enough money was allocated.

Other ideas were new. Some of the ten points listed earlier illustrate that we have left too many of the people in our society alone to their own inadequate means to provide for themselves a proper and honorable position in society. We have neglected vocational education and governmental service just to mention two particular areas. In a society in which status is so important, we have not found ways to promote those occupations that do not require a college degree.

We hope the conference meets its objective of throwing light on the vast area of human resource development, but we leave it to the reader to judge after reading the following Conference Proceedings.

AN ASSESSMENT OF IOWA MANPOWER

Governor Harold E. Hughes

It is a privilege for me to have a part in this conference today. Since I have been in public life, it has seemed to me that it would be quite possible for a government official to spend practically his entire existence attending conferences—most of them of no apparent relevance and worth to any of the problems that are on the public scene—without ever really waking up to what is going on in the world. But here today is a conference that is in the combat zone of what really matters and where the real problems exist. I commend and thank the Center for Labor and Management of the University and all of you distinguished participants for making it happen.

It is no secret to anyone with eyes in his head that the American society is going through what can most accurately be called a revolution—a period of crisis during which it will be determined whether this society, that has so much going for it, will come apart at the seams or whether it will endure in its intended pattern of peace, general well-being, equality of opportunity, and justice for all.

It is within our power to determine whether this revolution will be peaceful or violent, successful or disastrous. We have an arsenal for success—vast economic resources, technological know-how, the traditions and ideals of a free people. We also have an arsenal for failure—indifference, prejudice, bullheaded resistance to change, and a history of neglecting our most basic social problems.

The job before us has a dimension greater than anything we have previously undertaken. We have grown out of our old clothes and have become an urban, pluralistic society, without ever learning how to live together in a way that will preserve our individual human values and be consistent with our avowed social goals. Now we are faced with catching up with the neglect of the past.

When you talk about manpower and employment, you are getting into the very core of our social problems. So it is of the utmost importance to evaluate our present successes and failures and to chart the strongest possible course for the future.

The past few years have brought the greatest period of economic growth and general development in Iowa's history. Each year brings a record for new industrial development in our state. New industry, of course, means new jobs. Since 1962, nearly one-billion dollars have been committed to 1,305 industrial expansions—some of them not yet completed. When they are completed, nearly 50,000 new jobs will have been created; more than 8,000 of them will require professional, technical, supervisory or managerial skills.

Stimulated by industrial growth, personal income has increased dramatically, surpassing seven billion dollars in 1967. As recently as 1965, authoritative economic studies had predicted that it would be at least 1974 before the seven-billion-dollar mark would be reached. Admittedly, Iowa's rising prosperity has been lifted by the national tide of economic growth. But in point of fact, we have risen well above the national tide. For every dollar that personal income rose nationally since 1962, Iowa has gained $1.58.

The combined thrust of industrial expansion and greater personal income has been translated into new job opportunities in other fields. In the last five years Iowa has gained more than 115,000 jobs exclusive of agriculture and manufacturing—40,000 in wholesale and retail trade; 33,000 in professional and skilled services; 10,000 in medical and health services; 11,700 in construction; and 26,000 in state and local government, the vast majority of which are in the field of education.

In the midst of all these statistics, we have, of course, the deplorable conditions among us here in Iowa, as across the nation, of people who have not participated in this rising economy, both those who have not been able to develop skills for jobs or those who have skills but are not acceptable for jobs.

In agriculture, of course, the downward trend in employment continues as a result of the technological revolution that has been going on for forty years and is continuing. It is difficult for a young man to embark on a career in farming these days. His ability to succeed has come to depend less on his ambition and ingenuity, and more on his financial resources. Spiraling farm costs and badly lagging farm prices have aggravated the farm employment picture. Correspondingly, job opportunities have declined in some farm-related areas—the dairy, poultry, and grain-handling industries, for example. But at the same time, job opportunities have shown substantial growth in the service occupations, machine operation, and other semiskilled occupations.

It is too early to assess the actual impact of the area vocational-technical school system on the manpower development picture in Iowa, since the system is less than three years old, but I am sure no one questions the fact that this was one of the great breakthroughs in Iowa's history. The interest in these schools and the enrollments have exceeded everybody's expectations. In fact, the schools have grown so rapidly that they have had acute growing pains and are faced with many really challenging problems. But we have an excellent system under way, and certainly we can stand a few problems of overly rapid growth in preference to the long history of deadly inertia we went through before we faced up to this vital need in 1965.

So here in Iowa, we have a great deal going for us that has benefited employment in the state—specifically our unparalleled industrial development of recent years, the increase in personal income, and the establishment of a long-needed system of vocational-technical education. Our unemployment rate is low among the states.

We also have some tough problems in employment that are a long way from being adequately met—problems such as reaching the hard core of the unemployed, eliminating discrimination against minorities, surmounting the barriers created by unrealistically high education and experience requirements for employment, and overcoming restrictive apprenticeship standards in the trades.

As all of you are aware and as was mentioned in the introduction, a year ago I started to try to relieve some of the unemployment problems of youth in the major cities in Iowa. It was obvious as the summer wore on that there were thousands of young people on the streets of our cities with no work and no opportunity for work. These were the followers, those who would follow the rebels. Most assuredly, something had to be done. In this instance I appealed to business, industry, and financial institutions of our five major cities to contribute themselves, to set up nonprofit corporations for community improvement, to furnish jobs, to screen, to go out and seek and to help these youngsters find employment. I asked the cities, the state, the counties, the schools, and everyone to participate. We have extended that further this year. As was mentioned, they raised a great deal of money, and in less than a month had over a thousand young people working. It did accomplish a great deal. This year we must do more.

For so long, we in our states have sat back and cried about the federal system growing too large and taking over state areas of responsibility. We cannot blame the President of the United States or the Governor in Des Moines for the problems that exist in our cities if we are unwilling to attack those problems ourselves in those cities. The responsibility lies with us at home and it begins there. We must do more than we have ever done before in our lives. It's *our* responsibility. But we can and we will do the job, and what we have done is a very good beginning to what must come in the immediate future.

These tough manpower problems, like our other major social problems, can be met only by the combined total resources of both public and private sectors of our society. As the 1967 Manpower Report of the President to Congress points out, government can not meet this challenge alone; private industry must get into the act to a greater extent than ever before.

Urgently needed besides training programs and expertise in personnel management are the willingness to invest substantial sums of money in new personnel programs, the courage to try new approaches, and the application of a little realistic common sense to offset the red tape in prevailing personnel practices.

I am told of an industry that required a high school diploma and some previous experience and, as a result, was able to hire only one out of every twenty persons interviewed. After dropping the high school diploma requirement, reducing the experience requirement, and instituting a program for training workers on the job, this industry found that it was hiring one out of every *four* persons interviewed. Management, in this instance, was willing to try a new approach based on the realities. And the realities were that the actual qualifications needed for this employment were simply basic literacy and normal dexterity.

Government has made great strides in the manpower field in the past decade, but I believe the day is upon us to reassess the goals and methods and attitudes of our public agencies dealing with employment. Our goals in the area of employment have changed; social and economic conditions have changed; but in certain respects, our institutions have not kept pace with these changes.

We have seen our stated goals develop from the declaration of full employment as a national goal in 1946 to the announcement of an Active Manpower Policy in the 1964 Manpower Report of the President. Of the three elements of the Active Manpower Policy—development of abilities of people, creation of a sufficient number of jobs, and matching men and jobs—the first two elements have received most of the attention.

To develop the abilities of people, Congress and the Executive branch have provided an impressive array of training programs: the Manpower Development and Training Act, providing for both classroom and on-the-job training; Neighborhood Youth Corps; Job Corps; Work Incentive Program; New Careers; and Operation Mainstream.

With regard to the second objective of the Active Manpower Policy—the creation of jobs—I would point out that the governmental practitioners of the New Economics have demonstrated the ability of our economy to respond to appropriate stimuli. The tax cuts of 1964 and 1965, for example, speeded up the growth of the economy and opened up additional jobs. Civilian labor force unemployment declined from 5.7 per cent in 1963 to 3.8 per cent in 1966 and got down to even lower rates in some months of 1967.

But it seems to me we have fallen short in fulfilling our Active Manpower Policy objectives in the third goal—matching men and jobs. At this point, it may be well to reassess the basic structure of our federal-state employment security system. Does this system need overhauling and does it need modernization? Some work and review in this area has been going on, but more needs to be done.

The employment security system has been given a greatly expanded role to play since its inception in the days of the Depression. Congress has transformed the system from one of a labor exchange to one now charged with outreach, recruitment, screening and placement of our most severely disadvantaged—those who only a few short years ago were "totally unemployable." And Congress has entrusted these vital functions to the employment security system, in many cases, without benefit of additional financial resources to meet the problems heretofore considered insoluble. Under these circumstances the task is even more difficult.

Whatever the reasons are, the federal-state employment system, in my estimation, is still falling short of meeting these new, difficult employment problems that have been assigned to it. As a matter of fact, there is reason to believe that it has become less effective than it should be in its original role of being simply a labor exchange. Only 16 per cent of job placements in the United States in 1960 were made through the federal-state employment service mechanism.

As Governor of this state, I instituted a policy two or three years ago of writing a personal letter to each Iowa high school dropout. Before I got this program started, I had the Employment Security Commission examine its records to see how many of the dropouts it was reaching. Before the letter-writing program started, only 14 per cent of the dropouts were finding their way to the local employment office. And that system is the central building block of our total range of manpower programs.

Under the Wagner-Peyser Act, the USES is charged with assisting "in maintaining a system for clearing labor between the several states" so that workers and employers in widely separated geographical areas can be brought together in orderly fashion. In this age of technology and automation, it would seem that we should be able to give almost instant assistance in placement to a machinist, a nurse, a toolmaker or a waitress who is moving to another area where there is employment. But, from letters and information I have had, unless I am badly mistaken, we are not in a position to supply this service without a considerable time lag. What I am saying is that we are living in the age of the computer, and our employment system needs to keep pace with the computer. It is very difficult to do this with all the other needs we have, but we must meet this need.

I do not mean by any means to level wholesale, indiscriminate criticism at the employment security system, and certainly I do not intend to disparage the many dedicated and hard-working people in the system. The system has worked with dedication and undying energy to meet the real problems of our country and our state. I know the many problems they face, that all of us face, in the governmental structure.

I know the problem of salaries. I know that other fields such as the ministry, teaching, the Peace Corps, VISTA and a host of other occupations are competing for the relatively small portion of our population who will be attracted to an occupation because of an opportunity to be of service to their fellow man. Salaries are not the whole story. I know that the costs of administering a vast public agency are astronomical these days and the almost total resistance to increased public expenditures seems to be stronger now than it has been in previous years.

But what I am saying is that employment is one of the key, vital elements—if not the most important single element—in the great moves our society must make to meet the crisis we face today.

I think, therefore, that our employment system should be financially strengthened, modernized, and professionalized to the greatest possible extent. We all should support these moves in order to meet the complex goals of our national manpower policy.

In conclusion, let me say that we in Iowa have a great deal to be thankful for, with respect to our manpower development and our general opportunities for pursuit of the good life. This does not contradict the fact that we face a social crisis in this time, the same as the rest of the nation. We must meet it head-on.

We have the resources, economic and spiritual, to meet these problems that sometimes seem beyond solution. In recent months, I have been in all parts of the state, talking to citizens from all walks of life—and I am convinced that we have the determination as well as the ability to make the big moves. I have never been so proud to be an Iowan, because Iowans are facing their problems with determination.

THE FEDERAL GOVERNMENT'S IMPACT ON MANPOWER TRAINING

Stanley H. Ruttenberg
Assistant Secretary of Labor

We are living in a world of rising hopes and growing expectations, accompanied by the development of a live and significant series of aspirations on the part of the people. Turmoil in this country is running rampant. Any attempt to reverse these trends of rising hopes and expectations and the turmoil which flows from it would turn the pages of history back to the separate-but-equal-facility concept announced by the Supreme Court in the late 1800's.

I recall an experience in the area in which I used to live—Arlington, Virginia, back in the early 1950's—when the separate-but-equal-facilities of the school system was the law of the land. A Negro high school student was interested in taking a course in computer technology. There were no computers in the Negro high school. There was such a course offered in a white high school, and this Negro student applied to take the course. What did the County of Arlington do with its school system and with that request? They did not admit the Negro student to the white high school; instead, they *abolished* the course in the white high school. This was the response to the rising hopes and expectations of that Negro student. Thank goodness it is not the case today.

The civil rights movement, however, is reacting today to that kind of response. There are many other examples that we could cite. We as a nation are trying to remedy in a few years what for a period of at least 100 to 150 years we permitted to develop and fester. Short-run solutions are not really possible without some turmoil.

In our cities we have a very serious problem—the separation of the races. That is like an internal cancer. It will continue to eat away at our cities and destroy them unless we find a cure.

Some human cancers can be controlled by surgery, some by medicines, and others involve long terminal bouts. Still other human beings will be fortunate enough to survive because a cure or suitable remedy will inevitably be found.

Will this be true of our cities?

Hate and fear and envy are on the verge of presenting us with a problem comparable to cancer. Can we find a way to cure this cancer in our major cities in time, as we are now striving with billions of dollars to find cures for cancer, heart disease, and the other dread killers and cripplers?

We are moving, as the Commission on Civil Disorders said, *toward* two societies —one black and one white. I do not think we are really *at* that point. We can avert it and we *must* avert it. The programs that have been set in motion within the past few years, to which the Governor and the Chairman have referred, are now moving forward with various degrees of success and speed. These cures, these programs, will do much to prevent our having two separate societies—one black and one white. That cancerous condition has already proved itself unbearable to a great segment of our citizenry and intolerable to most of the others. It also, in great measure, brought on the bloodiest war in our nation's history.

Many types of programs need to be pushed vigorously. Housing—certainly the whole model city program, slum clearance, rehabilitation of slum areas; education—the Elementary and Secondary School Act, Higher Education Act, National Defense Education Act, Vocational Education Act of 1963. All of these programs need to move forward. Welfare, accompanied by a better understanding of what the issues are, along with improvements to the welfare program is a pressing need. And most importantly, *jobs* for all who need them through the many programs that we now have under way. Those four areas—housing, education, welfare, and jobs—were the four major areas identified in the National Commission on Civil Disorders (or the Kerner Commission) as being those of vital necessity to move forward.

I want, however, today only to talk about the last of these four—jobs. I cannot take the time, nor am I able, to discuss our society's needs in the fields of housing, in education, and in welfare. But keep in mind that the area of jobs is just *one* area. It is an extremely important one. Nevertheless, it is only one side of a quadruped that needs to be attacked simultaneously from all sides.

Certainly much has happened and more will happen in the job arena. We started this decade with an Employment Service and Employment Security system geared to traditional services; i.e., to assist employers in filling jobs that they were willing to list with the public employment service. Because that was its only objective—to assist employers—the employment service tended to select people out of jobs rather than to select people into jobs by finding them the opportunities they needed. We did not provide them with the assistance they needed to become full-time employees. This is no criticism of the Employment Service as it existed at the beginning of the decade. Employment Service provided the testing, counseling, job development, job referral, and job placement that were its traditional functions. But our institutions need to change, to develop the concept of new approaches. They cannot stay with the status quo. Employment services throughout this country have made changes and are moving forward. Some move faster than others. Much has happened certainly in the last half dozen years with the enactment of new legislation that provided new tools and new authority for our employment system across the country.

In early 1962 the Area Redevelopment Act was signed by President Kennedy. For the first time, in areas of substantial unemployment, the Employment Service could provide training opportunities for individuals who needed such training. Never before had the employment services had such a tool to work with. Then, in late 1962, the Manpower Development and Training Act was passed providing the system to train the unemployed and the underemployed, and not distressed areas only but across the country in all states, in cities, in communities, rural areas. That program in the past six years has spent well over a billion dollars on training opportunities alone.

The Economic Opportunity Act in 1964, along with the Neighborhood Youth

Corps Program, the Job Corps Program, VISTA, and Community Action agencies —all provide additional outlets for those people Employment Service had to select out of jobs. Employers didn't want to accept individuals with their poor qualifications. Now the Employment Service has some additional tools that it can use to select people *into* training opportunities so that they can be placed in jobs, rather than saying, "We can do nothing for you at the Employment Service Office because we can't give you the assistance that you need."

Certainly the intervening amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act, providing basic education, a longer duration of training, and expanding the on-the-job training authority, also provided additional tools for the Employment Service. The redirection of the Manpower Development and Training Act to provide at least two-thirds of its trainees from the disadvantaged individuals moved us along in our effort to select people into jobs rather than selecting them out of jobs.

We now have an array of programs and a potential for the delivery of manpower services that none of us would have had the temerity to forecast a few years ago. Our challenge is simple. Can we make these tools work? Do we—the federal, state, local systems of government, working with community action agencies and manpower committees and councils around the country—have the will, the ability, the drive, the force, to make these tools work for us to help provide opportunities to those people who are now exhibiting the ever-rising hopes and aspirations of America? Here I emphasize once again we will have to reassess our federal-state employment security system. It needs modernization. It is falling short of attaining its goals. It is less effective than it ought to be. Very clearly it needs additional resources to do the job. It needs to really begin to change, as it is beginning to change across the country. We are now altering the status quo.

We cannot sit back and say, "What we're doing now, in terms of the disadvantaged, is selecting people into training opportunities so that they can be selected for jobs. All of this is but a passing fancy. If we wait long enough, that passing fancy will change and there will be another priority on the horizon."

This is not, and will not be, the case. The necessity of moving to assist the disadvantaged is a prime priority and will continue to be a prime priority of our Employment Security system. We can, and have already to a limited extent, accepted the new concept. We are assisting people, by moving them from the status of where they find themselves now—disadvantaged, unemployed, with low levels of education, inadequate training, as members of minority groups—into permanent jobs. In the private, free, competitive economy they have all of the training, all of the education and supportive services they need to be productive citizens.

This is our program. This is the goal we are striving for as one of the quadruped of concepts—housing, education, welfare, and jobs—that is so essential if we are going to meet the turmoil which grows out of the rising hopes and expectations of people. We must change. That is important. The Employment Service which is the key manpower agency must shift, and is shifting, from emphasis on service to the employer to emphasis on service to the whole community.

Employers must reduce hiring standards. They must redesign jobs. Employers must break down discrimination in hiring because of race, age, or sex. Employers must make a real effort to work with disadvantaged individuals. Many employers are doing this. Many more are adopting this broadminded policy every year.

The trade unions must examine their practices, and attitudes on race, on minority involvement, and afford active assistance for the disadvantaged. I am proud to say, as someone coming out of the trade union movement, that many unions have done this. Others are moving in that direction.

Welfare agencies must also take a fresh look at their caseloads and begin to move people from welfare rolls into the world of work. Many welfare agencies have done this.

Educators must develop a greater sense of urgency in tying the world of education and the world of work together. Learning and earning must go hand in hand as part of a successful educational program. Educators must cease to concentrate solely, as many have in the secondary school system, upon those students who move on to college. They must concentrate equally as much upon the larger proportion of individuals who, unfortunately, do not go on to college. These students must be prepared for the world of work. Many educators have moved positively in this direction. Others will follow.

Progress is our finest achievement. In the federal-state system of employment security, and the Manpower Administration in the Department of Labor, we mean business! We mean to move in the direction of helping, assisting, and bringing our assistance to the disadvantaged, with job opportunities being provided in the economy.

President Johnson, in his Manpower Message to Congress on last January 23, laid great stress upon four factors which are our guiding principles in the manpower arena today. I call your attention to the fact that the President, in his State-of-the-Union Message, gave manpower programs the first emphasis on the domestic scene after he finished the international problems. The first domestic message the President sent to Congress following the Budget Message, and the *Economic Report of the President*, was a special message on manpower. We have a high priority in terms of our program to move quickly and boldly into this area. These guiding principles set forth by the President in his January 23rd Manpower Message were: (1) coordination, (2) assisting the disadvantaged, (3) concentrated programs, and (4) involving the employers in the private sector of the economy.

The President particularly directed the Secretary of Labor to strengthen the Manpower Administration, to provide it with the means and assistance needed to insure that the federal-state system carry out its responsibilities in the manpower field. This realignment of our responsibilities is one step in the direction of better coordination of activities. More and more federal programs in the manpower field are coming under the aegis and the responsibility of the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor. Avoiding the duplication of effort and the multiplicity of organizations running a variety of manpower programs is all to the good. We must bring it together at the federal level, at the regional level, at the state level, and at the local level.

One way to do this is through a program which is now in its second year, whose acronym is CAMPS—Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System. This system has regional committees, state committees chaired by the governors or the governors' representatives, local committees, responsible to and responsive to the state committees, and chaired by an active participant of the mayor's designation. In the major instances these committees are either chaired by the Employment Security agency or somebody responsible in the state or locality for manpower programs. The CAMPS program tries to coordinate into one committee all of the people responsible for vocational education, vocational rehabilitation, elementary and secondary schools, model cities, economic development, Job Corps, Community Action agencies, and all other kindred programs. All wrapped together into one committee, they plan at the local, state, and regional levels the proper utilization of resources and focus on the other three key elements of the President's charge to us—namely, help to the disadvantaged, concentration on areas of high need, and the involvement of the private sector.

In dealing with the disadvantaged, the hard-core unemployed, the second major goal of the charge that we have, we started two-and-one-half years ago to redirect our Manpower Development and Training Program so that a larger number of minorities became involved, a larger number of individuals with less than an eighth-grade education became involved, a larger number of individuals who were on welfare became involved. We have partially succeeded. We have started a human resource development program within the employment systems across the country. This is designed to get our people out and working with the disadvantaged people in the community—not sitting back in an office waiting to handle only those people who come in and say they are looking for a job or are applying for unemployment insurance. Now we go out into the communities, talking with the people, working with them, establishing intake centers, in store fronts, in churches, in the neighborhoods where people live. We are working with and encouraging them, bringing them along, providing them with the help they need in order to move forward, to become sound and efficient workers in our free, private, competitive economy.

The importance of the experimental and development projects in increasing the effectiveness of the manpower programs cannot be overstated. We have used the experimental projects to develop and test out programs that have resulted in important amendments to the Manpower Development and Training Act. (The fact that the MDTA has proved so adaptable to changing conditions and so responsive to new developments in manpower program and policy makes it one of the outstanding laws of our time.) It is through the experimental and development programs that we have been able to learn. We are still learning about the techniques of manpower program management—techniques of outreach, of coaching, of remedial education, of counseling, for example. We are only beginning to learn about motivation. We still have a long way to go in this area. But we are putting what we learn to use in manpower programs around the country. Long after the present spate of manpower programs have run their course, we will be reaping the harvest of experience we have gained in the experimental and development projects.

The third charge is to concentrate our efforts and our resources. We are moving fast in that direction. We are setting up what we call Concentrated Employment Programs in many of the key areas around the country. Our Concentrated Employment Program is nothing more than a sound, deliberate system using one contract. We put all sources of funding into that one contract. It is administered by one agency in the community. That one agency concentrates all of those resources (regardless of source) on the target group of the population. This provides them with the assistance needed to move out of a state of being disadvantaged. Whatever help and assistance they need to become useful, efficient workers in the private economy is at hand.

This Concentrated Employment Program started about a year ago in twenty-two areas—twenty urban and two rural areas throughout the United States. This fiscal year we are establishing fifty-four more Concentrated Employment Programs, forty-four in urban areas and ten in rural areas. Next fiscal year we will start another seventy such programs—thirty-five in urban, thirty-five in rural areas. By July 1, 1969, there will be 146 Concentrated Employment Programs of which 99 will be in urban and 47 in rural areas. Concentrated Employment Programs are designed to bring the many programs, from a multiplicity of sources of funding, into one contract. If you don't think that is difficult, you try it in this man's government!

The fourth charge from the President in his Manpower Message was to involve more actively and aggressively the private sector of the business community.

We have a major program labeled JOBS—Job Opportunities in the Business Sector. This program is designed to get American employers to hire disadvantaged individuals—the hard cases. People with low levels of education and training. The federal government then assists in meeting the extra costs of training and supportive services that are necessary to keep these people on the payroll. It provides them with whatever they need in the way of training, education, or other supportive services to become useful workers. The commitment of private industry to do this is growing, but many private industries want to maintain the status quo. What's the status quo to private industry? It is: "You prepare the individual, see that he meets the qualifications that I set, then I will hire him." This concept on the part of private industry needs to be changed. It is changing and will become different.

There is now a national commitment by private employers to this goal in the form of a nonpartisan National Alliance of Businessmen put together by President Johnson, chaired by Henry Ford II, and including the top businessmen of this country regardless of political party. There is a full-time businessman, in each of the fifty largest cities in the United States, responsible for promoting the National Alliance of Businessmen by securing the active participation of private industry to provide job opportunities for the disadvantaged. Each full-time businessman is paid by his own company to actively engage in this endeavor. They are pulled together in seven regional offices across the country to coincide with the seven regional offices of the Manpower Administration of the Department of Labor. A local employer who makes his commitment to become involved in the JOBS program can be given the financial assistance he needs to put the individual disadvantaged worker on the job from day one, and then give him the training and supportive service he needs to become a useful worker. This program is moving forward across our country with a greater degree of change than one would have believed possible only one year ago.

The question really is: Is there the will, the drive, the initiative, to carry out these programs? Yes! No one can help but feel overwhelmed at the size and scope of the problem confronting us across this nation. We cannot be overwhelmed or dismayed or discouraged. We do not have all of the final answers at hand. We have not found the total cure for that social and economic cancer. But we are moving in the right direction. We are arresting the cancer. We may even be well on the road to finding a cure for that cancer, both in human beings and in our cities. Many more people will have a fuller and better life, I am convinced, as a result of the activities and programs that are now moving ahead at an accelerated pace.

Discussion with Stanley Ruttenberg Moderator: Edgar R. Czarnecki

QUESTION: My question pertains to small employers in Iowa who are faced with the continuing problem of hiring workers. With their limited resources and training facilities, what federal government programs are available to them?

ANSWER: There are at least three approaches to the problem. One is that here in Iowa, through the Manpower Council, there is a statewide on-the-job training program which provides financial assistance to employers who are willing to hire the disadvantaged and put them to work. It reimburses them for some of the costs incurred in such training activities. I would suggest that you explore this as the first possibility.

The second approach is through your own international union. The Department of Labor has a national contract with the United Auto Workers which is a very good one. We have similar contracts with the International Union of Electrical Workers, the Carpenters Union, the Machinists Union, the Laborers Union, and a variety of other trade unions. We also have a large number of national contracts with organizations like the Structural Clay Products, National Institute of Machine Tool Builders, and National Association of Tool and Die and Precision Machine industries. The purpose of that Auto Worker contract is to work with small employers and provide them with the kind of new employees they need. As a matter of fact, the UAW has set up training centers in a few parts of the country where they train individuals and then make them available to employers. Employers get some reimbursement for any additional training provided.

The third approach is the regular on-the-job training program. It is still available through our field representatives of the Manpower Administration who handle on-the-job training programs through the Bureau of Work-Training Programs, which is one of our three major bureaus in the Manpower Administration. Such field representatives are here in Iowa.

QUESTION: How do you answer the questions raised by the apprenticeship graduate who has gone through a training program, and who is confronted with the concept that employers should hire an untrained person from the disadvantaged minority groups? Is there a conflict here? What response should we make to people who have an education and who have had the opportunity to develop themselves through any number of training programs?

ANSWER: This is not a new problem. Obviously, we are all faced with the issue of having a limited amount of funds available to do a specific job at all levels of government—city, county, state, and federal. One has to take the hard position of establishing priorities. What is our nation's greatest priority or priorities? They are for the disadvantaged. Therefore, funds are going to continue to be used for that purpose. If the other individuals stay in school they are provided with very substantial financial assistance indirectly through the school system, which gives it to them if they do not drop out of school.

In apprenticeship programs, the individual gets his training through the efforts of the employer and cooperatively through the joint apprenticeship committee. So he is not really a problem. It is the fellow who drops out who is the disadvantaged, who does not have the initiative and the drive to stay with it, who is provided with assistance under this kind of program.

Now, granted, there are exceptions—extremes at both ends. There are people in the middle who would drop out and who would not stay in school but for some financial assistance. For that kind of an individual there is the Neighborhood Youth Corps Program which is quite extensive. Over 115-million dollars was spent on this program last year. You have such in-school programs throughout Iowa.

I hear the argument from trade union members: "Well, we earn seven, eight, nine thousand dollars a year. We have a pretty good job. But our kids cannot qualify for any of these programs." I say, "That is right. But just think of the many kids whose parents have only a two or three thousand dollar a year income, or whose parents are on welfare or have no income at all. If you were going to provide assistance to kids, to individuals, or to adults, whom would you help? The individual with a higher level of income or the individual with a lower level of income?" I think the priority system we have to establish should handle those problems. The Governor said one of the real problems is a lack of adequate resources for the Employment Security system to do the job it ought to do. I agree with that. If there is to be no increase in resources for the Employment Security system, shouldn't that Employment Security system reallocate internally its own resources to the area's highest priority? They must; they are; and they will do more of it.

I think that while there will be some dissatisfied because they cannot participate, the majority of people who need training will get assistance.

QUESTION: How can we follow Title 29 and also become part of one of the Concentrated Training Programs? How long before the Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training is done away with?

ANSWER: The Bureau of Apprenticeship and Training is not going to be done away with. I do not know whether that was a leading question or just a straight question. It is not going to be done away with. Title 29, CFR 30, is a Department of Labor Regulation which provides for equal employment opportunities in the assistance of individuals into apprenticeship programs across the country.

Your question was: How can you comply with that and still give assistance to the disadvantaged? I have heard the argument advanced by some unions that Title 19, CFR 30, instead of providing equal employment opportunity for minorities, forces the union to discriminate against minorities. There might be something to that argument but I doubt it. We in the Department of Labor are jointly working with the labor movement to contact employers across the country to provide technical assistance and supportive training to the minorities, so that they can qualify to get into the apprenticeship programs.

QUESTION: Could you give some statistics on the extent of the Manpower Development and Training Act as to the number of participants, number of graduates, etc.

ANSWER: I do not have the statistics at my fingertips, but I will try to answer your question from the best of my memory. The MDTA bill was passed in March, 1962, and funded in August, 1962, and has been operative since mid-1963. MDTA has put through, or is currently training, close to 600,000 people, of whom 400,000 have already completed courses. The placement record in job-related activities is 87 per cent of those who complete the training.*

One of the criteria for the establishment of an MDTA program by law is that the Employment Security agency in the state predetermines that there is a "reasonable expectation of employment" for the individual and for the occupation for which the individual will be trained.

We have in training currently about 180,000 people under MDTA in both institutional and on-the-job training; as you know, the average duration of the training course is about thirty-one weeks. Forty per cent of the MDTA trainees are from minority groups; over 7 per cent have less than an eighth-grade education; 19 per cent have eighth grade or less; about 11 per cent of the trainees come from public welfare rolls.

QUESTION: We have heard a lot about testing recently. Could you elaborate on the use of tests as they are currently used, both to include and exclude individuals from jobs?

ANSWER: Just one year ago I came out here to Iowa to this same university and participated in a conference sponsored by the Center for Labor and Management, focused solely and exclusively on the question of the use of tests in employment practices. It was conducted by a visiting professor at The University of Iowa at the time, Bert Gottlieb.[1] Today I realize a great deal of updating has taken place and a great deal of modernization of the tests is under way in this one year. But employers—both public and private—are not culturally adjusted yet to the background and experience of a large number of people who today are coming into the labor force and who in days gone by would have been excluded by the same tests. We need to eliminate many of the kinds of tests we use now. We need to modernize them. We need to develop nonverbal testing. We need to really move forward.

---

*Editor's Note: As of the end of the fiscal year 1968, MDTA enrollment totaled 1,034,400 with 612,200 having completed training. Of those who have completed training, 480,500 were placed in jobs.

[1] Proceedings of this conference held in May, 1967, are available from the Center for Labor and Management.

I do not mean to imply that nothing is happening in this area—because a lot *is* happening. The U.S. Employment Service has a unit under Bea Dvorak, who has devoted years of her life and time to the modernization of our testing systems.

One of the real problems is to get private and public employers, including the Civil Service Commission of the United States Government (to say nothing of civil services practices within states), to accept the concept that the tests they have used are no longer the tests that ought to be used today. Even though more modern techniques and better concepts of tests are available, it is difficult to get people to change. We are having our problems getting the United States Civil Service to change its procedures for federal employment. They are doing it slowly, under great pressure. State civil service commissions are doing the same. Employers are doing it as well—but not quickly enough to really adjust to the problems.

QUESTION: We have talked here a lot about the necessity to train people in a technical skill, but little about those work habits that would make them better employees. What is being done in this area?

ANSWER: I usually like to take a provocative position which forces people to become a little disturbed and angry because it sometimes causes them to think a little harder.

Let me take your question and turn it around if I might. One of the reasons why we have now moved quite extensive sums of money into the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector program (JOBS) is that employers have been unwilling to accept the responsibility to do precisely what you are asking us to do. You are asking whether, outside of the employer, there is some place in the public sector where programs are designed to adjust people's thinking and concepts as to what a good day's work is. What does it take to report in the morning, to be dressed properly, to talk correctly, to know what it is to take a break and come back? This kind of personal adjustment training is going on in the public sector extensively throughout the MDTA program in skill training centers across the country.

As a matter of fact, there is a specific provision in the Manpower Development and Training Act which urges state employment service systems to set up a two-week orientation program on the premises of the employment service to get people to adjust to the concept of what a good day's work is, why it is so important to report on time and to stay throughout the day, to take only the breaks when they should, and to adjust themselves to job psychology.

One of the reasons we moved to the Job Opportunities in the Business Sector and are saying to the employers, "You hire the person from day one and you provide him with what he needs to become a useful worker in a private competitive economy," is that we think business (and business itself thinks so) must provide this kind of help. It makes more sense to the individual employee if the employer provides this kind of help than it does for us to set him off in a separate place for two weeks and say, "If you just pay attention and adjust to what you are taught, you will be able to get hired down the road."

QUESTION: How many people in this disadvantaged group today are qualified to receive this type of assistance and where do they get it?

ANSWER: One of our biggest manpower problems is the shortage of people who are able to develop this kind of sensitivity training or adjustment training. We just had a meeting in Washington the day before yesterday with a group of representatives of some of the private learning corporations—subsidiaries of large corporations like the Westinghouse Learning Corporation, Philco Ford, and Subsidiaries of Whittaker Corporation, Lytton Industries, 3-M and Bell and Howell. They have established themselves in the training field with educational subsidiaries for the purpose of seeing whether we can develop the kind of technical assistance that is necessary to employers. Now, you certainly know of the MIND program which the National Association of Manufacturers developed and which has become a private profit-making corporation on its own, which does provide this kind of help and assistance. The Board of Fundamental Education in Indianapolis and its Director, Dr. Blackburn, are working extensively with private industry around the country to provide this kind of help. There are unions that are doing excellent jobs, and you are going to hear about one union this afternoon—the International Union of Operating Engineers represented by Reese Hammond. This union has done a sensational job of adjusting hard-core individuals to the concept of wanting to work and knowing what a good day's work is. As a matter of fact, the Operating Engineers are running a Job Corps camp, and they are going to run a series of other Job Corps camps just for the purpose of doing this kind of thing.

We also are providing employers with the kind of assistance they need to really train the trainers. This is a problem that we recognize, and there are partial aids here and there; but I dare say business has got to spend a bit more of its own time, money, and energy to make sure that it has some of its own staff people who can do this kind of work.

QUESTION: I am not sure whether Mr. Ruttenberg will agree with this or want to comment on it, but I sense a move in the direction of a kind of force-feeding taking place. As I see it, responsibility for working with the disadvantaged in a cognant way is being written into a lot of government contracts—specifically one in the Model Cities program where the requirement is that there will be maximum participation by indigent people; secondly, in the award of a number of federal government contracts, particularly in the construction field, with requirements for manning these. I don't particularly object to the idea of having two different approaches. On the other hand, it may very well be that this concept of tacking on the responsibility for this positive corrective action will in the future be put on all federal government contracts. If that's the case, I think we ought to know about it.

I want to repeat—I don't think it's bad. Maybe it's a good idea to spread it throughout the community so that we can no longer create these training ghettos.

ANSWER: I think I understand the implication of the question. I might just briefly restate it to make sure that I am going to hit the major point you are raising. Would you restate the question this way: Does all this emphasis we now see on involving private industry in the training process mean that this is going to be the exclusive approach to the problem?

The answer to that is very clear and direct: It is necessary to have a wide variety of tools and programs available to do the very difficult job before us. A great deal of the job can be done and must be done in public institutions, such as that provided by the Neighborhood Youth Corps, or Operation Mainstream, or the other adult work programs. A great deal more of it can be done through the skill centers under MDTA throughout the country. Some of it can also be accomplished through the Job Corps.

The emphasis currently on the JOBS program, where individuals are trained with private industry involvement, ought to be put into its proper concept. In terms of the two-billion-dollar manpower program appropriated by Congress, 244-million dollars (just a little over 10 or 12 per cent) will go into Job Opportunities in the Business Sector (JOBS). The reason for putting 10 to 12 per cent of the money in the next fiscal year into that program is that we find that our other programs need support.

To get back to the question asked earlier about statistics on MDTA, we can turn the statistics around the other way. About 13 per cent of the people who graduate are not being placed in job-related occupations for which they have been trained. What we are trying to do with JOBS and the emphasis on the private employers, is to say: For that 13 per cent something else needs to be done in order to get them into jobs. We think experimenting with the idea of placing the responsibility solely and exclusively on the employer will bring this about.

If we move toward trying to find opportunities in the private sector for these people whom we should have never put through MDTA because they did not get jobs at the other end, it does not mean that we can ignore the problem presented by the other 87 per cent, who do benefit from institutional type (MDTA or Job Corps) training and who need to be in that kind of an operation. Both programs will continue and in about the proportion that those figures represent.

QUESTION: What is the ultimate goal of the federal government as far as a standard of acceptable unemployment as a percentage of the work force?

ANSWER: I do not think it is possible to determine or establish what a full-employment economy should be without regard to considerations relating to the degree of inflation one is willing to tolerate and the degree of price stability that you want to attain.

Unemployment today is 3.6 to 3.7 per cent, and averaged about 3.75 per cent over the last year and a half. That seems to be the level we can attain with current degrees of fiscal budget and monetary policy, accepting the price stability or inflation that flows from it. But, if one wants to reduce unemployment further as we do, and as the government does, and as the administration has specifically said it wants to, then the way to do this is to employ those individuals in the society whose unemployment rates are high—namely, minorities who run twice as high as regular unemployment; youth, three times as high; and minority youth unemployment, four to five times as high as the nationwide average. If you carry it a step further—young, minority, females, whose unemployment rate is six to seven times the nationwide average—then obviously the only way you are going to reduce unemployment is through manpower policies acting in relation to the prices and inflation created at this lower level of unemployment. Therefore, we concentrate on minorities, on the youth, on females and the aged. Twenty-five per cent of our unemployed are 45 years of age or older. We can attain a much lower level of unemployment than the 3.7 per cent we have now. That is our objective.

QUESTION: Does the exclusion of the hard-core unemployed and the definition of what is an unemployed person tend to undercount the number of persons listed as unemployed?

ANSWER: I don't want to engage in a discussion of the definition of the labor force and how we determine who is looking for work or not looking for work. However, I think it is fair to say that the overwhelming majority of the hard-core disadvantaged people who are unemployed are included in the unemployment figure.

There is an undercount in the unemployment figure. I was one member of a six-man commission (chaired by Professor Gordon of the University of California) appointed by President Kennedy to examine employment and unemployment statistics. We stressed in our report that you get an undercount that results from the following kind of problem: When the interviewer from the Census Bureau asks, "Are you actively looking for work?" if the response is negative you are not included in the labor force. However, if an individual happens to say, "I'm not looking for work now because there is no work available in my community," which happens in many of the hard- and soft-coal regions of the country, and other distressed areas, he is counted as unemployed because he volunteered that piece of information. This is only one technicality, but there are a large number of these kinds of technicalities; so it is estimated that there is probably an undercount of anywhere from 10 to 12 per cent in the unemployment figure.

But there is another side to this picture. Let's turn the question around: If somebody reports that he worked one day last month, he is reported as employed and not unemployed in the current statistics, so that we have a large number of people who are underemployed at less than their full capability. As long as their incomes are in the poverty level, those also are classified within my definition of disadvantaged and therefore would be over and above the 3.6 per cent.

QUESTION: You used the figure 3.6 per cent; then there could actually be more unemployed today than last year, even though last year the unemployment was 3.8 per cent. Is this not true?

ANSWER: Well, obviously when one deals in percentages as against absolutes the problem is different. When the total labor force goes up, say, from 70 million to 80 million, and if 3 per cent are unemployed, then 2.1 million are unemployed at one time and 2.4 million at the other time. You always have the problem of absolutes versus percentages.

QUESTION: As Chairman of this program, I have a question of my own. It deals with appropriations. Most of the programs discussed here depend on government allocation of some resources. The future of these programs depends on the continuation of this allocation. What do you see in the immediate future concerning an allocation equal to or more than exists today, both regarding the programs themselves and as they pertain to the number of people dealing with these problems?

ANSWER: During the course of the last four weeks I have spent a total of seven working days before the House Appropriations Committee and two working days before the Senate Appropriations Committee. I can report to you that the prevailing sentiment in those committees (which really determine whether or not the monies are going to be appropriated) is very much in agreement with President Johnson's January 23rd Manpower Message, very much in agreement with his State-of-the-Union Message, and his Budget Message. That is, that manpower problems, job opportunities, the preparation of people for employment have a very high priority.

Workshop 1

CONTRACTUAL RELATIONS: THEIR EFFECT UPON EMPLOYEE TRAINING AND UPGRADING

Remarks by Workshop Moderator Harry E. Graham
Assistant Professor and Program Director
Center for Labor and Management
The University of Iowa

Recent years have witnessed a dramatic change in the management of large-scale organizations. Aided by the availability and understanding of the potentials provided by electronic data processing, managements have, to an increased degree, expanded the role of planning and forecasting. One area that has come in for increased attention has been the planning and development of manpower resources. This trend has been accelerated by the Vietnam war and its associated manpower shortages.

Historically, managements have been concerned with the development of supervisory and executive personnel. Considering that business corporations are not eleemosynary institutions, this emphasis is to be expected. Managerial skills are among the most valuable assets available to an enterprise and may determine whether the organization languishes or prospers, thrives or withers. In addition, executive and supervisory positions normally have a great deal of discretion associated with them. Thus, the holders of these positions may require periodic training to upgrade their skills in order to utilize the latest management techniques. Finally, the supply of managerial talent is generally short relative to the demand for its services. Thus, corporations are wise to train their executive-level personnel to perform better in their present positions and to prepare them for future promotions.

Since the needs of the enterprise for production and clerical personnel are different from its needs for supervisory and executive personnel, it has generally approached the training and development function from a different point of view. Short-term needs are normally met by recruiting personnel from the labor market. When such personnel are no longer needed, they may be terminated or laid off. Where management does place employees through a training program, that program is tailored to meet the needs of the enterprise for a particular skill, and not to the long-run interests or needs of the trainee. Thus, it is rare that production or clerical staff are trained and promoted to management posiitons beyond the first-line supervisory level.

What emerges is a pattern of training and development which is somewhat at variance with the rhetoric of conferences such as this one. Training activities for blue-collar and many white-collar job holders are really relevant only to the needs of the enterprise. There are few, if any, corporate training programs that concentrate in the area of expanding the horizons of the employee. The courses are vocational, to fill the need of the firm. In addition, training efforts frequently have the effect of limiting the trainee to a department, area, or plant, and are not general enough to aid him in a search for alternative employment.

While the rationale for management development programs is apparently persuasive to those responsible for them, the unions are beginning to wonder if the training efforts for production and clerical workers meet the test of social responsibility. The experience of training for dead-end jobs or for work soon to be eliminated has occurred too often to be disregarded. While the unions have often expressed interest in the training area, it has often developed after the shock of a plant closing or mass layoff occasioned by technological change. Concern at that time is remedial, not preventive. There have been some noteworthy exceptions to this general lack of concern. Unions in the graphic arts, particularly the International Typographical Union, have had training programs of long duration. Local 3 of the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers has had a vocational and liberal arts training program for many years, and some unions in the construction trades, notably the Plumbers and the Operating Engineers, have vocationally oriented programs.

In the area of the liberal arts the unions have done little. The Steelworkers conducted a twelve-week general education program at Indiana University several years, and in 1968 the Communications Workers conducted an intensive eight-week liberal arts school for nineteen local union presidents at The University of Iowa. The Auto Workers are currently embarked on a plan to make available to their membership in the Detroit area an Associate degree in labor. Finally, several university labor education services are experimenting with various types of liberal arts programs for labor. Experience to date has been mixed.

Unions, then, have not shown much willingness to invest time and money in continuing training efforts. This attitude probably reflects the feelings of the membership to a large degree. In addition, a union is understandably reluctant to undertake training that is likely to remove a member from its jurisdiction.

Where unions have negotiated training clauses with employers, such clauses are often general in nature. For example, an agreement between the International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite, and Paper Mill Workers and the Stone Container Corporation at Florence, South Carolina, reads:

> The Company will assist employees in developing their capacities and in preparing themselves for advancement and will help make available a training program designed to assist each employee in developing an optimum level of knowledge and skill.
>
> Each employee receives indoctrination and orientation training, job training, and other types of general and specialized training that are considered necessary.[1]

One wonders if clauses such as this can be carried out in any form that will enrich the life of the employee.

This workshop, held as part of a day-long conference on manpower problems, hopefully signals a change in the historic attitudes of companies and unions toward training. Donald Hock, Corporate Director of Industrial Relations for the J. I. Case Company, presented a paper discussing the problems companies face today in recruiting and retraining an appropriate labor force. He touched upon the contract clauses which relate to the training function and the various approaches and problems to be found in dealing with people with various skill levels. Mr. Hock's paper stressed the following points: (1) this is a mutual problem confronting both labor and management; (2) each level of skill confronts employees with a totally different problem; (3) the whole area of training and the cost of programs needs to be scrutinized carefully to determine the value of training to the corporation.

---

[1] International Brotherhood of Pulp, Sulphite and Paper Mill Workers, *Selected Clauses in Collective Bargaining Agreements in the Pulp and Paper Industry Related to Automation and Technological Change*, Washington, 1964, p. 19.

Rudy Oswald from the Research Department of the AFL-CIO noted that unions have been interested in training as it relates to job security. He made the point that seniority is often a good criterion for promotion, since senior employees are often able employees. He also noted that appropriate economic policy is required to insure that trained people do in fact have jobs available.

Mr. Oswald stressed an important point that is often overlooked, particularly by those outside the industrial relations field—that there is a tremendous contrast between the construction or building trades unions and the industrial unions; this distinction is prominent in the types, quality, and quantity of training programs needed. The difference in structure, organization, and leadership between these two groups conditions the training responses that are forthcoming. Mr. Oswald details these differences and illustrates his observations by specific examples of the training programs suited to the particular type of unions involved.

The discussion period focused on the disadvantaged and contrasted their needs to those of the people already employed by industry. The question raised was how to provide equitable training programs for both groups without offending either one. Can a dual standard be prevented if particular hiring and training practices are altered to fit the needs of the disadvantaged? If certain workers receive additional or preemployment training, how can we insure that this will not jeopardize the incumbent worker? If the qualifications for hiring are lowered and, as in some cases, coupled with particular training programs, where does this leave the recently hired employee? Is he not at a disadvantage later when future promotion opportunities come into being? This particular problem was very succinctly raised by the following question: "Can a person be disadvantaged in the job he is currently in?" This dual standard may be a problem today but it is likely to become more acute in the days ahead when automation will result in additional demands on the existing work force, with the accompanying need for retraining workers—many of whom will be older workers. This problem will have to be met by companies planning their future manpower demands more accurately. Trade unions and government will have to expand their training efforts to meet the needs of the work force in the coming decades.

It may be unrealistic to expect to achieve a more perfect labor market through the actions of private parties. In the final analysis, we may be forced to ask government to conduct the necessary research and action to insure the best utilization of manpower resources.

Paper presented by
Rudy Oswald
Department of Research, AFL-CIO
Washington, D.C.

Developments in recent years have heightened organized labor's traditional concern over the training needs of American workers. A growing number of unions have been focusing increased attention on this problem at the collective bargaining table. And, at the same time, the labor movement has been in the forefront of the legislative efforts to expand government financed manpower training activities.

This renewed emphasis on training is a natural outgrowth of the rapid changes in technology. Increasingly, the demand is for workers with new, different, and greater skills. As a consequence, without added opportunities for training, an ever-growing number of workers are faced with the likelihood that the good jobs will pass them by. Or even worse, that they will have no jobs at all.

It has been said often—and bears repeating—that the labor movement does not consider *increased training as the answer to* the problems of automation and technological change. In the final analysis, the ability of people to find work, no matter how well trained they are, depends upon the availability of jobs. And the availability of jobs—enough to meet the needs of a rapidly growing workforce, plus jobs for workers displaced by automation and technological change, plus jobs for those already unemployed—depends upon the nation's basic economic policies, and not on training.

On the other hand, it *is* a function of training to help workers acquire the skills which will enable them to qualify for whatever jobs are, or will be, available. In view of the vast changes that are taking place in the economy, and in view of their impact on the skill needs of the workers, it is to be expected that the labor movement would be paying increased attention to the problem of training.

This is no new problem. For the labor movement it is an old and continuing problem. It is, however, a problem which has now taken on new dimensions. It is a problem which has been intensified by the scope of the changes taking place and by the speed with which they are occurring. And it is a problem which is complicated by the special needs of different groups—the young workers, the older workers, the workers with inadequate education, and the nonwhite workers.

In short, it has become a much more complex national problem.

This is a problem which, even before it took on its present dimensions, never lent itself to a simple solution. And, just as the problem has become more complex, so, too, have the answers. More so than ever before, the efforts to deal with the skill needs of the workforce must be tailored to meet the needs of a variety of groups and a variety of situations.

In recognition of this fact, the labor movement has carried forward its historic support for a number of public programs in the manpower field. In recent years it has actively lobbied for many important federal programs that promise to improve the opportunity of workers to develop the necessary skills.

The Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962 is such a program. Another is the Economic Opportunity Act of 1965. Moreover, since education is so essential to preparation for the world of work, mention should also be made of the Vocational Education Act of 1963, as well as programs to aid education generally—from the lowest grades on through college.

All of these measures are part of a package that seeks to deal with many different pieces of the problem of manpower preparation and development. While they may not deal adequately with all of the needs, they do represent a constructive effort to cope with the rapidly changing skill needs of the workforce in a modern economy.

And so is the renewed emphasis which unions are giving to training problems at the negotiating table. What is going on at the bargaining table in the field of training is, in the tradition of collective bargaining, *an effort to go beyond the public programs.* Through collective bargaining, the unions are seeking to develop approaches that are closely tailored to the needs of the different groups they represent.

Nor is it at all unusual for this issue—that is, the training needs of the organized workers—to be a matter for discussion between labor and management. The only thing that has changed is the nature of the problem. But the basic issue, the factor which gives rise to the problem, has not changed at all. That issue is job security.

Unions have always indicated a keen awareness of the relationship between job security and training, or at least between job security and the *opportunity* to train. This is true for all unions, although in some cases it has been more visible than in others. For example, the traditional involvement of some unions in apprenticeship programs is clear evidence of this interest.

Not so clear, however, is the involvement of most of the industrial unions. But that interest is—and always has been—present, even where the industrial unions are concerned. It merely takes on a different coloration, one that fits the role of those unions in the industrial setting in which they exist.

A distinction must be made as a result of the different roles played by the unions in the different industries. In the construction industry, as an example, the unions have an important function in the job market. They are a unifying element in what would otherwise be chaos. The workers generally do not stay very long on the payroll of any single employer. The employer takes on workers as he needs them and, when the job is finished, they go on to work for a different employer. This process is repeated many, many times during the course of the year.

The employers in the construction industry depend upon the unions in order to get workers with the necessary skills at that point in time when the employers need them. Consequently, the unions in the construction industry are in a position where they must inevitably be quite sensitive to the skill needs of their members. And because the construction industry is so fragmented, with many relatively small employers, the unions have a major role in the development and administration of the apprenticeship and retraining programs.

The situation in manufacturing industries is completely different, and so is the role of the union. In manufacturing, the employer has a permanent workforce.

Generally speaking, he does not hire people simply for short-run jobs. Moreover, many of his jobs—unlike the jobs in the construction industry—are not skilled and do not require extensive training.

In contrast to unions in the construction industry, a union in a manufacturing plant has little or no role in the hiring process. Instead, its role generally begins after the worker has been hired and once he is on the payroll. At that point, the individual is covered by the agreement over wages and working conditions which the union has negotiated with management.

At first glance, this would seem to suggest little or no involvement with training in the typical manufacturing situation. This is not the case, however. Rather, the involvement takes on a different form than is seen in the construction industry, and it is less visible. It is, however, an involvement that is tailored to fit the needs of the setting in which the industrial unions find themselves.

Seniority plays an important part. In order to provide maximum protection for the workers with seniority, unions seek to give such individuals some degree of preferential treatment. This applies, for example, to layoffs. And it also applies to promotions. The unions usually insist that the senior workers be given first crack at the opportunities which exist. In line with this, the agreement usually requires that management must provide a training or orientation period in order to enable the senior employee to qualify.

The longest-service employees generally are the most experienced, ablest, and most reliable persons for the job.

Some years ago, Professor James J. Healey of Harvard University investigated fifty-eight situations in which an arbitrator had set aside management's decision to promote a junior employee on grounds of superior ability over a senior employee.

He inquired of each of the companies involved, in each case at least three years after the arbitrator awarded the job to the senior man, to find out how the senior man made out on the job which management had not wanted to give him.

It might be assumed the companies would tend to justify their original choice of the junior man, but the large majority of the replies to Healey reported the senior employee proved himself able on the new job, either immediately or in a short period.

Even more significant was a frank statement in most of these cases that management now doubted whether the junior employee it originally favored would have done any better on the job. Also, in half the cases the senior employee had already advanced since the disputed promotion to still higher-rated jobs.

In less than a quarter of the replies did management say it still thought promotion of the senior man was unsound.

Healey pointed out several reasons why the senior man worked out so well. Management may have been correct in judging the junior employee more able, but the extra ability may have stimulated the senior man to good performance. In addition, some companies pointed out the problem of determining relative abilities; the appraisal of abilities of the senior and junior employees depended a good deal on the particular supervisor.

But managements are beginning to turn away from supervisory appraisal of abilities, moving to psychological testing procedures instead. Here again unions are concerned; they are concerned with the misuse of testing. They are beginning to ask questions such as these:

1. For what purposes are the tests being given? Are they for considerations for promotion, transfer, layoff? Or are they to test knowledge of a certain job or for jobs higher in a line of progression?

2. How was it determined that the test actually serves the stated purpose? What procedure did the company or organization follow in validating its test?

3. Is the test deemed to be relevant to a particular job or group of jobs in the company? If a test will pick the most able maintenance man, will it also pick out the most able line assembler? What statistical or research evidence is there that the tests actually identify the best employee? If research was done to determine the validity of each test, against whom were the test results validated? Was it employees on the same job or jobs? Was it employees in the same industry or within the same company? Was it trainees in a company or students in some school not connected with the industry?

4. Are cutting scores used to select the worker with the most ability or are they used to determine which workers, eligible for promotion, are likely to meet the minimum qualifications for a particular job?

Generally companies cannot provide adequate answers to these questions. As a result unions remain skeptical about the use of psychological tests, both in principle and in practice. Unions still favor as the real test, a trial period on the job by the most senior employee bidding for the job.

In its concern with promotions the industrial unions have forced upon management a training activity that might not otherwise exist. It is the steady upgrading of the workers already on the job—movement up the skill ladder in small jumps—so as to permit them to advance to better jobs as the openings occur.

Furthermore, when changes are made in production methods, they may not result in a reduction of the total workforce. Often new jobs are created which numerically offset the jobs eliminated. But the worker threatened with the loss of his job can take little comfort from this fact unless he is assured of an opportunity to secure one of the new jobs. Also, since the new job may differ in skill requirements from the old, he may need retraining.

It is a completely different approach to the problem than that which exists in the construction industry. But this is because the problem is different. It is an approach which ties in with the realities of the mass-production industries, in which the production workers are called upon to perform one operation repeatedly. On the other hand, in the construction industry, there is a need for all-around skilled workers who can perform the many different operations which are a part of their craft.

One major reason that this difference exists is that the production process in manufacturing industries has been "rationalized," and the construction industry has not. That is, the machine has taken over in manufacturing, and it has reduced the need for workers with all-around skills. A typical production worker is not called upon to perform one operation one day and a significantly different operation the next.

In construction, however, this may very well be what happens. And because the craftsman has benefited from extensive training in all aspects of his craft (the function of the apprenticeship program), he is able to carry out any part of the operation.

One positive result of all this is that, since the skilled craftsman is able to perform a wide range of operations, he will not end up out of work because he lacks the skills for any part of the job that needs to be done. This is true for a skilled worker, regardless of the industry in which he is working. It even applies in manufacturing where, for example, most of the maintenance workers are in the "skilled" category. Such workers simply have more options to fall back on than a worker who is not skilled.

The more industry is "rationalized," the more workers are reduced to performing a single operation repeatedly, the less equipped they become skill-wise. This is not to say that automation does not raise skill requirements. In many cases it may. But, quite often, the reverse is true. And as more workers become appendages to machines (a process that is being repeated in one industry after another and in any number of occupations), the less they are called upon to develop their skills. Consequently, they are handicapped when the need arises to shift from one job to another or from one industry to another.

Today, however, even the skilled worker has reason to worry. Automation and technological change can wipe out his skill. Or if it does not completely wipe out his skill it may substantially alter the skill requirements; and to the extent that he cannot cope with the changes, he faces increasing spells of unemployment.

The construction industry is a good example of this. It has not been left untouched by changing technology. Techniques are changing as a result of the development of new equipment and new materials. As a result, so too are the skill requirements; and the typical journeyman must constantly learn anew in order to stay up to date.

In some crafts they pick up this added knowledge on the job. They learn by doing. But often this is not enough. As a result, joint labor-management programs in the construction industry are paying increased attention to the need to improve the skills of journeymen. An example of such a program is that of the United Association of Plumbers and Pipefitters which is financed by employer contributions to a Training Fund. Under this program over 60,000 journeymen have received additional training during the past ten years.

Another program in this vein is that run by the International Brotherhood of Electrical Workers. The IBEW, for example, through the NJATC of the electrical construction industry (financed jointly by the Union and the National Electrical Contractors Association), provides journeymen with the opportunity to attend classes covering a wide range of subjects. There may be refresher type courses, or they may be courses to advance the skill and knowledge of the journeymen. In a sense, the object is to enable the older journeyman to keep up to date with the recently graduated apprentices.

An additional approach is exemplified by the Packinghouse Workers and Meatcutters contracts with Armour which provide that funds from the automation fund may be used to train workers for other jobs in the community when they are displaced by plant closings.

Basically then, the training approaches that appear in labor-management contracts may be summarized as programs that provide basic apprenticeship training for skilled workers and postapprenticeship skill-improvement programs. Some contracts call for on-the-job training, while others provide the funds for workers to participate in general courses offered by vocational schools—or even college courses. Whatever program, it must be tailored to the needs of the particular group of workers, their union, the firm and industry involved.

The IBEW has carried this skill-improvement concept over into other parts of the union's jurisdiction. Skill-improvement training programs conducted by the Union—as distinct from those carried on through the NJATC for the electrical construction industry—are available to members who work for gas and electrical utilities, communications, railroads, atomic energy, and manufacturing.

Retraining programs in the printing industry date back to 1908, when a correspondence course in printing was established in Chicago by a local newspaper under the direction of the International Typographical Union. Since then the ITU has continued to set up programs to keep its membership abreast of technological change. The Printing Pressmen established a printing plant for the retraining of pressmen in 1917, allowing the membership to operate any new patented press.

Industrial union programs most frequently emphasize on-the-job training as the proper vehicle for upgrading. In addition, some contracts also provide for vocational school courses or participation in broad governmental training programs. A few contracts even provide for some sort of college training. (This disregards a number of contracts that establish college scholarship funds for some sons or daughters of the current workforce.)

Paper presented by
Don E. Hock
Corporate Director of Industrial Relations
J. I. Case Company
Racine, Wisconsin

The manpower problem of attracting, training, and upgrading personnel is much bigger than any concerned with specific contractual language. These areas are the basic problems that confront companies today. The union, as a party to a collective bargaining agreement, inherits as its members those employees hired and trained by the corporation.

The training problem exists in all levels of skill from the entry level, unskilled jobs, through the semiskilled and skilled areas. The approach to training differs widely within these skill levels.

The approach and answer to attracting, training, and upgrading differs a great deal between companies and therefore must be approached in respect to their individual problems. Such factors as size, location, types of manufacturing and skills required, ability to automate, ability to hold employees, types of training, and the cost of training are a few of the factors that make this understandably an individual problem.

This is an individual company problem because there is no pat answer. Companies have a variety of problems in attracting people to certain jobs and in training and upgrading them. One thing is known: There are certain factors that make companies attractive. Wages are a factor, but above this is the opportunity for advancement afforded to the workers.

When we face a recruitment decision we can go off across the country trying to satisfy our skill shortage and yet end up not fully meeting our demands. We have to stop begging and build sound training programs.

Often we do not really utilize the abilities we have. For example, we are too strict in our employment practices by not considering the handicapped for worthwhile opportunities in our companies.

Industrial unions often feel they get second choice because they have to live with the people we hire.

Basic to the approach to this problem is the day-to-day atmosphere in which the company and union work with the administration and application of their collective bargaining agreement. Recognition on the part of both parties that this is a common interest area is essential. This greatly affects the contractual language needed or developed in the area affecting training, upgrading, etc.

Present-day collective bargaining techniques, where industry bargaining and pattern settlements take place, can result in restrictions that affect local application in some areas of training and upgrading.

Unions are faced with the same problems as management across the whole spectrum, from the area of employment and training the so-called hard-core unemployed through apprentice programs in the skilled-trades areas. It only seems logical that unions not build in further contractual restrictions in these areas, but rather work with management on sound flexibility that will help overcome further problems in these areas.

In negotiations, which take place usually in a matter of a few weeks, or at most a few months, areas such as technological change, underemployment, job enlargement, etc., cannot possibly be considered; therefore the importance of flexibility in contract language cannot be overemphasized.

Every company is looking for the same skilled employee, even to the extent that in the last ten years we now recruit coast to coast. Major metropolitan papers are continually loaded with attractive ads searching for the same person. We have mobile recruiting offices and mobile interviewers roaming from location to location, running headlong into each other, frantically attempting to supply the needs. Trade journals, society publications, etc., continually stress the skills shortage we face.

The only real answer or long-term solution is further improved programs in broad training and development areas. Present studies show that management rates its training programs 50 per cent effective. This isn't good. From attracting and training the unskilled through the training and development of the skilled, the following areas of contract language come into the picture for consideration:

Probation Period
Seniority
Temporary Transfer
Layoffs
Job Posting
Job-Classification Changes
Training Rates
Instructors' Rates
Skilled-Trades Units
Temporary Work Assignments
Shift Preference
Past Practices

All of the foregoing areas are samples of contract clauses that exist in most union contracts to a greater or lesser degree. They all become involved in some way or another in the approach to attracting, training, and developing employees.

The task at hand can more appropriately be designated by a term very commonly heard today, "human resources development." It cannot be handled at contract negotiation time, but rather must be continually and patiently worked on.

Today in the training picture we have quite a change taking place. There is a shrinking of the unskilled. We see higher levels of requirements in the semiskilled, and our personnel practice hasn't kept pace.

The lower levels of semiskilled jobs are vanishing, and we are getting up to a higher level of semiskilled jobs; so we need to develop the people coming out of lower level, semiskilled jobs to be able to compete for these types of jobs.

Unskilled:

The basic problem is the employment of the hard-core unemployed.

Also to be considered is the recommendation of some for the use of dual standards.

The effect the above approach has on probationary period, seniority, and job advancement.

Semiskilled:

The approach is exactly opposite the one for unskilled where detailed job breakdown has more application.

The need is to make jobs broader and more encompassing.

The problem is one of restrictive job classifications and write-ups.

The change in production processes and technology has a greater impact in this area, along with the accompanying fear this causes many employees.

The areas of contractual language involved here generally are seniority, temporary transfer or assignment, job posting, classification changes, training rates, etc. This involves a larger number of people in the workforce than the skilled or unskilled areas.

It is the desire of employees to move away from the semiskilled areas to the skilled areas.

Skilled:

Critical shortage problems due to restrictions of apprentice ratios.

Long training periods required for apprenticeship.

More realistic look at apprentice programs.

Entrance restrictions to move into skilled-trades groups.

In the final analysis, it is up to us to see that what we do and how we do it contributes to our individual companies. It is only through profit that a business can grow, and it is only through business growth that more and better jobs are created for all of us. We cannot pass the buck; it is our responsibility.

Workshop 2

THE EFFECT OF LABOR AND MANAGEMENT POLICIES ON THE SUPPLY OF SKILLED WORKERS

Remarks by Workshop Moderator Anthony V. Sinicropi
Associate Professor and Associate Director
Center for Labor and Management
The University of Iowa

The most productive machine in the world naturally needs an ever-increasing supply of skilled workers. Statistics from the Department of Labor continually stress the acute current shortage and the immense future gaps in the area of skilled manpower. Our educational system, while producing the largest number of college graduates of any country, does not produce enough skilled plumbers, electricians, carpenters, etc., to meet the needs of our system. Our apprenticeship system has been bitterly attacked, primarily by government and management groups, because of the lack of graduates from these programs. The consuming public often is heard to complain of poor and inadequate workmanship by skilled groups, in addition to the familiar complaint that this type of service is prohibitively expensive.

Historically, this nation has had a shortage of skilled manpower. In this, the last half of the twentieth century, the problem is upon us with more gravity than ever before. Our rising technology and our more sophisticated society demands that we rely more upon skilled people who possess a great deal of expertise. Despite the pockets of unemployment, the discussion of equal employment opportunity, and programs designed to match people and jobs, we as a nation have not yet been able to supply enough talented manpower in those industries and jobs where there is the greatest need.

What are the factors that contribute to this shortage of skilled manpower? How much of the fault can be put at the foot of the apprenticeship programs? How much is due to the basic lack of vocational training in our education system? Besides finding the basic causes of our skilled shortage, what can be proposed to resolve these problems?

This workshop presents two knowledgeable people who are directly and presently involved in the skilled-training area, and who are daily involved in trying to maintain the quality of our skilled workforce and in insuring that we adequately meet present and future demands in this area. Frank G. Werden, Midwestern Region Director of the National Electrical Contractors Association, and Reese Hammond, Education Director of the International Union of Operating Engineers, are both well qualified to discuss the skilled manpower problems since both have had a wealth of practical experience.

Mr. Werden concentrated his talk on maintaining the high standards in the apprenticeship programs. To meet the challenge of the shallow reserve of skilled labor, Mr. Werden suggested that we make the construction jobs more attractive by making employment more secure and less seasonal, thus creating a new and more favorable image for such jobs. In addition, Mr. Werden further suggested that vocational education and training be given more support in terms of a national commitment with a philosophy of channeling youngsters into such programs at an earlier stage in their educational development.

He also indicated that the ability of the industry to attract quality people and to retain those people was quite difficult. Perhaps what might be needed is two programs—one to work on these people a little earlier in their vocational training, to give a new image and a new kind of spirit to the vocational programs, to give them the kind of status they should have and should be recognized for; and, secondly, that preapprenticeship type programs be started so that these people can be steered at an earlier age. In other words, attract people into the program before they become dropouts.

Mr. Hammond stressed that our apprenticeship programs have been successful when viewed in the light of their original objectives. He indicated that our skilled labor, although insufficient in number, is, indeed, versatile, mobile, and highly qualified. As evidence of this fact, he points out that manufacturing has long used the trades and construction area as a recruiting ground to locate and attract skilled personnel. Mr. Hammond accepted this as part of the market system and stated that the trades should be proud of their contribution to the skilled labor pool in the United States.

Mr. Hammond emphasized that he would like to maintain the existing high standards of apprenticeship programs because they have been successful in this country if you look at them in terms of their objectives. You have qualified people with high degrees of skill and individuals who have mobility and freedom to keep this level high for the benefit of their employers, and to adjust labor supply to the ever-changing demands of the economy.

While it is evident that both panelists were proud of the past contributions of the apprenticeship programs, they were not satisfied with the status quo. They both see a need for a national commitment to elevate skilled jobs to a new and higher status in our society and feel this can be achieved by influencing the value structure in society. In addition, both men see a greater need for more governmental interest through new programs and increased financial aid.

When dealing with the several questions posed by those attending the workshop, the panelists made some of the following observations. The hard-core problem cannot be solved by placing unqualified minorities into skilled jobs. The equal employment opportunity question for blacks and the mass unemployment question must be handled primarily by manufacturing where the bulk of jobs are semiskilled and unskilled. The skilled jobs available in the trades can only attract and assist those few in the minority groups who possess the extraordinary abilities to adjust to the job demands.

Both speakers insisted on the maintenance of quality training programs and cited the need to utilize those resources committed toward training of the skilled workers so that these people would be retained in their own occupation rather than seek alternative employment. Suggestions to assist this retention included both the guarantee of an annual salary, the working out of schedules so that employees would be active throughout most of the year, and finally providing for paid furloughs in times of slack work.

Both speakers were united in urging more and better quality of vocational education, assisted by earlier counseling of students so that they would embark on skill-training programs earlier in life. In response to a question, "Isn't it too early in life to make a choice of what you want to be?" Mr. Werden said, "Wouldn't it be better for students to have some skills in the vocational area rather than too little education to become a college entrant?"

Mr. Hammond felt that we should improve the quality of education by broadening it so that students can learn about other areas besides those that are strictly professional.

Because the International Union of Operating Engineers has a training program through Job Corps Centers, many questions were directed to Mr. Hammond who supplied us with the following information: There were fifty graduates in this program last year, 1967, and there will be sixty-one in 1968. These graduates were sent to twenty-seven states and into thirty-nine different locations, on the basis of (1) where they came from, and (2) the availability of work in their home area.

Both panelists urged that government programs now in operation be enlarged and intensified and that additional national efforts be given to adequately meeting the needs for skilled workers.

Perhaps in summary, one can note that both speakers rejected many of the "easy" solutions to the lack of skilled workers produced by our apprenticeship programs, such as reducing the length of the programs, eliminating the high school requirements, or setting up separate categories of pay for different types of skilled work. "There is no short cut to quality," could be a sentence that summarizes this workshop.

Paper presented by
Frank G. Werden
Director, Midwestern Region
National Electrical Contractors Association
St. Paul, Minnesota

The title of this workshop indicates that we are searching for results of the efforts of both labor and management to fulfill their responsibility to recruit and train workmen, and, more particularly, in those skills involving apprenticeships. First, I will attempt to make an analysis of the present supply of skilled workmen and secondly, attempt to offer some ideas that may help overcome this problem as it affects the construction industry.

The nature of the industry indicates that there are many peaks and valleys of employment depending upon a number of factors. Even in the same trade we sometimes have too many people, sometimes too few at the same time. Unions constantly have the fear that too many people will be "on the bench" and therefore often don't have enough available manpower. However, in the northern portion of the United States, weather conditions have a strong influence on the level of employment. This factor, plus the strong urge for job security, perhaps has been the strongest deterrent to train men or for the unions to agree to create a sufficient manpower pool to fill the manpower requirements even for moderately good industry growth without taking into account, of course, the extreme growth in the construction industry in recent years. If sufficient skilled manpower is to be developed, these problems must be taken into account and some method or methods adopted to overcome the fear that workmen have of either being laid off because of weather conditions or a lack of any job security.

Labor has been promoting a thirty-five-hour week and one of its prime arguments for a thirty-five-hour week is the distribution of the available work. A thirty-five-hour week, in my opinion, while it may be justified for other reasons, in no way offers any cure for the problems involved and, in fact, works just the other way. This statement can be borne out by the fact that when more work is available than workmen to perform it, an artificial shortage is created adding to the cost of the job by pyramiding the cost of overtime on top of the normal costs of building construction. In slack time, it does not provide any additional jobs as contractors are prone to keep more men on their payroll during slack times than is necessary, in hopes of having a crew available if a job comes along.

While there are many other factors bearing on employment in the construction business, it is my opinion that these two factors are uppermost in most of the workmen's minds, and job security has become almost a must in America.

Time will not permit me to address this talk to other factors; therefore, I will attempt to offer some solutions for the problems raised. However, before doing so, I would like to point out one additional factor that must be taken into account if the industry is to train sufficient people to meet the demand.

It is generally assumed that the supply of skilled manpower has been furnished through the apprenticeship programs up to the present time. An analysis of the background of the rank-and-file workmen in the skilled trades would show that many of them learned their trades on the job without any formal apprenticeship. This came about as a result of the building activity during World War II when all available men, some with limited experience, were recruited for construction work in connection with the war effort, and the high level of employment after that period allowed many of these workmen to continue in the various crafts and become quite proficient.

With most construction work centered in the metropolitan and urban areas, and the shift of population from the farms to the urban areas in recent years, many skilled or semiskilled tradesmen have moved from the rural areas into the more organized centers. This has made a substantial contribution to the skilled manpower pool available in the metropolitan and urban areas where the shortage is more acute. But in many instances it has created a shortage of qualified craftsmen available in the rural areas. This has been proven in Minnesota by the fact that second class, or B licenses for electrical contractors and journeymen had to be created for small villages and towns and rural areas. These licenses were created on limited skills in an effort to enable contractors and workmen to perform ordinary electrical work required in connection with residential and farm activity. Many of the skilled craftsmen who migrated to the urban and metropolitan areas because of work opportunities and higher rates of pay had not served any formal apprenticeship.

While there are many dedicated men who have served on apprenticeship committees, both from the unions and from the contractor associations, history will prove that the contractors show very little interest as a whole in apprenticeship programs during times when no shortage of manpower exists. However, it suddenly becomes a great concern when there is not sufficient manpower available to meet the industry needs. While both the trade organizations and international unions have been aware of the problems concerning the training of sufficient manpower to meet industry needs, very little study has been made on a local basis to anticipate the needs of the industry over a period of time, and instead they have lived from hand to mouth. The local unions, as a whole, attempt to restrict the number of apprentices to protect the employment possibilities of their members. It is only in recent times that the contractors have become fully aware of the problems behind the manpower shortage and have taken a real interest in overcoming the situation.

One of the biggest problems is the type of person we are attracting into the apprenticeship programs. It is related to the question of what an apprentice should know by the time he comes out of school. Many talk about taking care of the high school dropouts, but what are we to do with them when we need people with some mathematics and science? Is an employer asking too much when he sets minimum educational background requirements along with a couple of solid subjects? What we need is a method to maintain these people in school for two or three years instead of putting them on the market and expecting them to be picked up right away. We should not tear down the foundation of the trades; we should still require an applicant to meet standards and not lower them to fit the applicants. We should train people purposefully, even on the elementary school level. Labor should show more interest in basic education. They are always operating on the higher level of education, and there seems to be a gap or breakdown in communication between the international and local.

We are going to have to think in terms of preapprenticeship; show these youngsters while in high school that they are going to have to learn a trade. They have to begin to anticipate this in the eighth grade, not after they become dropouts. This means that if we start thinking about young people now, our problem will disappear in four years. The problem can be cured if we start with them when they are 12 years old and prepare them for useful fields of work. We can't continue to push them into college educations; we must show them they can achieve something worthwhile by working with their hands.

It is incumbent on the industry, if it is to attract and maintain skilled workmen, that some program must be laid out whereby apprentices can acquire related training during times of low employment and be available on the job when manpower is needed. This could be accomplished by establishing a program where apprentices in the skilled trades would be required to attend classes of related instruction, perhaps for three months each year during their first two years of indenture, and work the balance of the year. This would have the effect of taking a substantial number of workmen out of the field during the low period of employment created primarily by weather conditions and make them available when most needed.

Skilled journeymen should be rewarded for proficient services by being given some preferential rights for employment based on their performance and longevity in the industry, which would mean employment rights based on seniority. They should not be subjected to being submerged in a pool without giving some recognition to their prior service and performance such as the so-called "referral procedures" which give employment rights to workmen simply because their name is first on the list. Naturally, men will gravitate toward jobs that offer more security even at lower rates of pay, under such circumstances, which means that the building industry is training workmen for maintenance jobs and the like where their skills can be used simply because of job security.

Some program must be devised to furlough skilled journeymen during times of low employment in order that such employees will be available when needed. This could be accomplished by creating a trust fund to which contractors would contribute, based on some formula within the labor agreement, and provide that workmen be reimbursed out of this fund to the extent that contributions would be made on their behalf at such time as they may be furloughed by their employer because of lack of work. It is my opinion that this could be accomplished more economically than the cost of a thirty-five-hour week and the increased cost of unemployment. It should provide a method of coming closer to providing a paycheck to the employee each week of the year.

The construction industry should be indicted for its lack of interest in our modern education system, as it appears that the industry may have left the educational program entirely up to the educators without making the needs of the industry known. Further, it appears there is an urge on the part of the educators to upgrade a college education and to depreciate or neglect the need for training required for entrance into the apprenticeable trades. It is my candid opinion that not enough emphasis is put on the subjects required in most apprenticeable trades and more emphasis is put on the students becoming mathematicians instead of electricians.

To summarize, then, the construction industry has been characterized by insecurity; this has led to some attempted solutions but has not addressed itself to the problem that without security we cannot attract young people to our industry.

The second major problem in the construction industry is to continue to maintain the educational standards of the trade while urging reforms on our school system to provide more people with the necessary minimum qualifications to the trade.

These thoughts are not necessarily the views of the National Electrical Contractors Association but are my own observations after a lifetime in the electrical industry.

Paper presented by
Reese Hammond
Director, Research and Education
International Union of Operating Engineers
Washington, D.C.

We recognize that the majority of skilled craftsmen are going to come from the same sources as in the past. The appropriate title of this subject would be "The Great Brain Robbery." The contractors rob us of our really talented journeymen and make supervisors of them.

There are basic differences between the various skilled trades. There are the basic trades, such as laborers, carpenters, teamsters, and operating engineers; there are specialized trades such as the mechanical trades, the electrical trades, the trowel trades, etc. The problems of these two groups are, of course, different. There is a great deal of "body snatching" going on where industry is stealing highly qualified skilled people from the trades because industry can offer more secure jobs without the effects of cyclical fluctuations.

Employment opportunities for skilled tradesmen will be great, since employment and population projections indicate that the country will grow by 50 per cent in the next thirty-eight years. Consequently, the amount of building construction, as well as other construction to meet economic and social needs, would more than provide adequate opportunities for those trained in the crafts.

There are three purposes of apprenticeship:

1. To develop and maintain a qualified workforce for the industry, who will be universally acceptable to employers and contractors.
2. To train the individual person, provide skill so the individual will not suffer from lack of talent and resulting sporadic employment.
3. To maintain a standard of quality of a trade accompanied by a feeling of pride and independence by the artisan.

The employer is concerned about the *quality* of the work force. The individual craftsman is concerned with his *talent* to provide a steady income for his family. The union wants to *maintain high performance* of the trade.

One basic reason for apprenticeship is that management looks upon it to fill future supervisory needs. There can be no denying that it has accomplished this in the past.

How successful is the apprenticeship program? It is highly successful for the people who complete apprenticeship, but 50 per cent of the apprentices drop out within the first year and a half. This problem is not unique, because it is equal to the percentage of students who drop out of college. More significant is the estimation that approximately 85 per cent of the mechanics now working at the trades never completed apprenticeship. Apprenticeship is not the major source of qualified craftsmen in construction. Some come from vocational schools and many have picked up a trade via other informal, on-the-job channels.

After reviewing generally the basic aspects of the apprenticeship program, let us take a close look at my union, the Operating Engineers.

Our prime concern is to take care of the present members of our union and to prepare for the influx of potential members. We recognize our responsibility to society to provide skilled workers. In this regard we have developed a continuous total training program where we teach any skill, at any level, at any time, for any person.

Secondly, we take care of the person who, by one avenue or another, has found his way into our union. We have obligations to these people to afford them the opportunity to learn other and newer skills.

Finally, we fill our obligation to society by preferring to give a person a hand-up rather than a hand-out. We don't turn our backs on those disadvantaged segments of society. We realize that there must be some promise of equality of opportunity, and it must be meaningful. We have to motivate these young people, and we cannot deny them the right to try—even if they fail.

Vocational educational schools are misused. They get a bad name because we push students into them if they are not preparing for college, instead of using such schools as a preparation to provide incentive and training for students in the skilled-trades area.

The requirement for a successful training program is cooperation of all parties concerned. In general, employers have not in the past been responsive to preparing their employees. What is required on the part of everyone who has to do with manpower policy is a deep sense of commitment and, above all, a willingness to *do* something. We have unparalleled tools to do a complete job in this country. All it takes is a sense of commitment, a willingness to improve; if we don't we are going to strangle. Make the commitment—be responsible—take care of your *own* manpower needs.

Workshop 3
MANPOWER PROBLEMS IN PUBLIC EMPLOYMENT

Remarks by
Workshop Moderator Thomas P. Gilroy
Program Director
Center for Labor and Management
The University of Iowa

The continuing interest in specific manpower problems is no more evident than in those programs dealing with state and local government manpower. There are two major factors that have accounted for concentrated effort in this field. One is the increase of the total number of people employed in these sectors, accompanied by projections for a continued increase in this area. Second is the militant effort of various unions to organize people employed in the government sector. The latter factor was aided unquestionably by Executive Order 10988, proclaimed by President Kennedy in 1962, and followed by the enactment in many states of similar laws dealing with the rights of public employees to organize and bargain collectively. The large increase in governmental personnel has brought about increased pressures for workers in all levels of government. Not only are there increased needs for professional, technical, clerical, and maintenance personnel, etc., but many of the new jobs are in totally unique and challenging fields such as urban renewal, jobs for the disadvantaged, air pollution, detoxification centers, and a host of other interesting assignments. We need to open new horizons for highly educated people to enter these challenging fields of governmental service and impress upon them the advantages of employment in this sector.

In attempting to narrow somewhat the many possible discussion topics under the heading, "Manpower Problems in Public Employment," this workshop focused on two specific problem areas: the first concerned with attracting and retaining competent public employees, the second centered on the growth of public employee unions and their impact on the policies of public employers.

Unlike the other workshops, and because of a unique set of circumstances, this workshop has three rather than two papers. Don Wasserman of the American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, originally scheduled to appear, was unavoidably detained because of the famous Memphis garbagemen's strike, and his place on the program was filled by Dr. Hervey Juris of the School for Workers at the University of Wisconsin. We have included both the remarks that Mr. Wasserman would have made at the conference, had he been present, and those delivered to the workshop by Dr. Juris.

Gerald Howell, Iowa Merit Employment System Director, in his paper on attracting competent public employees, outlined the major barriers, as he sees them, to recruiting and retaining good people in Iowa. In addition, he suggested steps that might be taken to alleviate these problems. Mr. Howell stated that the most serious problem may be the image that many hold of government employment. This takes the form of viewing government employment as a last resort, as a bridge between jobs, or as a haven for the inefficient, with low pay and political favoritism the rule of operation. These attitudes may be due to lack of positive personnel programs, lack of competitive pay schedules and fringe benefits, and the inevitable publicity attending the actions of government agencies and employees. The latter, Mr. Howell pointed out, may unwittingly stress the negative since it is news.

Mr. Howell also mentioned it is his view that quite often people look upon public employment as a last resort, the last kind of job to be taken when there is no alternative. He mentioned the view that sometimes it is looked upon as an interim job until you find the one you are really looking for. He mentioned the difficulties of political situations creating insecurity for the public employee. He mentioned raises being based on something other than merit quite often. He indicated that, of course, poor pay and often lack of good working conditions contribute to this negative image. Why is this image current today? He stressed outdated personnel programs, lack of grievance procedures and career development programs, lack of increases based on merit. Mr. Howell also hit rather hard at the lack of competitive rates.

As to solutions, it was suggested that the state establish an agency responsible for a progressive personnel program, that agencies unify in presenting their needs to the Legislature as part of a public relations program, that a new training and development program be initiated and, further, that the state be willing to provide the means to do an effective job of attracting and retaining employees.

In his paper on union-management relations in the public sector, Dr. Juris focused on the municipal employment situation. Arguing that while it may be difficult for public personnel officials to adjust to dealing with a union, Dr. Juris asserted that a union may actually ease some of the problems of recruitment and retention.

He pointed out that exaggerated fears of the strike must be overcome before stable relationships can be developed. He argued that employee motivation for unionization in the public sector is not significantly different from that in the private sector and that quite often it is the employer, through his policies, who really organizes the union. He called upon public employers and legislators to accept unionization. Dr. Juris pointed out two major structural problems that complicate the public employer's bargaining task. One problem is that, while the legislative branch appropriates funds, the executive branch handles personnel problems. The second problem arises from the possibility of having a number of different unions competing for the best settlement with the city fathers. Further complicating matters is the wide range of experience and competence on both the public employer side and the union side. The public employer may now be forced to "share the authority while remaining totally responsible for the results."

Dr. Juris noted that collective bargaining is surely not a panacea and he reviewed the experience of policemen and firemen as a case in point. He mentioned what he felt was the overemphasis in this area on the fear of the strike as being quite often stressed too much, when it is really a symptom, not the problem.

Quite often the real problems, as Dr. Juris pointed out, are learning to understand what collective bargaining is all about rather than holding up the bugaboo of a strike. While it is a problem, try not to overemphasize it.

He mentioned some of the motivations that lead people into group activity. He suggested that quite often they are similar to the motivations that move people into collective bargaining in private industry: for example, an inequality of bargaining power, a desire to have some voice in personnel policy, a desire to redress grievances through some formalized system, etc. Dr. Juris used the quotation that some of you may know about employers quite often doing most of the organizing rather than the unions. He suggested that legislators provide only the hunting license for the union. It's quite often the employer who really sets the conditions that lead to organization.

Donald Wasserman, Director, Department of Research, American Federation of State, County and Municipal Employees, stressed in his conference paper the need for accepting the reality of public employee unionism. He outlined what the public employer should expect in dealing with an organization such as the AFSCME.

Mr. Wasserman pointed out that hard bargaining can be expected and drew analogies between private and public sector bargaining. He argued that negotiation is a bilateral system of decision-making in both situations and that just as the process varies by industry, likewise will it vary in the public sector.

Mr. Wasserman viewed the Civil Service System as an arm of the employer and as a method of unilateral determination of employment conditions and argued that it should not be used as an excuse for not negotiating. He called for state laws, independently administered, setting a framework for collective bargaining, providing for exclusive recognition and a broad scope of bargaining. The majority union, he argued, should be allowed to negotiate for a union security clause and dues checkoff as well as grievance procedures culminating in binding arbitration.

Mr. Wasserman rejected the argument that the collective bargaining process is dead and held that it is "alive and well and is entering the public sector."

The workshop discussion was evenly divided between the two areas covered by Mr. Howell's paper and Dr. Juris' paper, with many questions being raised regarding the new merit system currently under consideration in Iowa.

Since it is new, there were many questions directed to Mr. Howell as to how the new merit system will function. Mr. Howell mentioned that the law provides for a separate merit system which must conform to requirements of law to be established by the Board of Regents. Rules must be submitted to the Merit Commission which must formally approve these rules. The Director of Merit Employment must review them. If not in conformity, they will be modified to right the wrong. This system will be tied together at the top through the Merit Commission.

The merit system will determine by its own rules what priority to give seniority in deciding who will move between jobs. We will have some ways to handle this —for example, allowing some credit as part of final score for years of service. There is no set pattern for seniority to be directly recognized as a determining factor. This is an arbitrary decision.

In reply to a question: "How does the merit system determine what is a competitive wage?" Mr. Howell said the competitive area determines the rate of pay. We are not in competition across state lines except in professional areas. Survey of prevailing rates identifies benchmark classes. We must project for two years in the determination of what we would be paying up to three years from now. This is one reason why we favor annual sessions of the Legislature. We never get caught up. Some states provide for across-the-board increases. Sometimes pay raises are considered to be a reward not only for service but to reflect an increase in the cost of living.

An interesting discussion followed a question on why the state publishes earnings of all public employees with incomes of $12,000 a year or more. Mr. Howell felt that the publication of such lists puts the wrong emphasis on high salaries, since it does not publish those below $12,000 and unfortunately does not inform the average citizen on the quality of those people employed—which is really the ultimate question.

Mr. Juris handled several questions involving the operation of collective bargaining at both the state and local levels. Questions pursued such areas as the bias of those in the academic profession in siding with the unions in disputes, but when cases of disputes arise the blame is generally on the public agency for failure to resolve the conflict.

The workshop papers and discussion pointed up the fact that there are two forces working toward the same end: The public employer consciously looking for sounder personnel policies and the employee organizations seeking to speed the process and influence the decisions being made.

Paper presented by
Gerald Howell
Director, Iowa Merit Employment System
Des Moines

When I was asked to prepare a brief paper for presentation at this meeting on the subject of problems encountered in attracting employees to public appointment, the task appeared to be an easy one. As I began work on the subject, I found that a challenge was not in obtaining material but rather how to present it in the brief time allowed. As I made notes for the paper, enumerating some of the problems encountered within my own experience, it became apparent that a mere listing of the problems could present a discouraging picture to those persons responsible for attracting qualified personnel to the public service. In an effort to avoid this possibility, an attempt is made to present some suggestions to challenge officials responsible for attracting employees to the public service in their attempts to overcome the problems confronting them.

Perhaps the most serious problem confronting officials in their attempts to attract qualified personnel to the public service is the general attitude of the public toward governmental employment. The effect of these attitudes is very real even though they may be without foundation. In discussing some of these attitudes, it should be realized that they may be prevalent in some areas and absent in others.

Some of the attitudes that I have heard expressed during my experience in the public employment field are:

1. Employment with a governmental jurisdiction is a "last resort" when all attempts at employment in the private sector have been unproductive.
2. Public employment is considered the interim ending in obtaining satisfactory employment in the private sector.
3. Public employment is another form of welfare for those who are unable to obtain or hold a job in the private sector.
4. Governmental employment is considered as "feeding at the public trough."
5. There is no security in governmental employment beyond a change of administration.
6. The advancements and promotions are predicated on political or other favoritism.
7. Public employment pay is generally poor with the "lion's" share of the taxpayers' money going to "high-paid" officials.
8. Working conditions in public employment are generally poor from the standpoint of both physical surroundings and employee benefits.

No doubt there are many other attitudes, both positive and negative, which exist in the minds of the public, but the above gives some indication of the attitudes which tend to discourage well-qualified persons from applying for jobs in government at all levels.

Granting that the above-expressed attitudes exist in varying degrees, it would behoove us to attempt to analyze the probable causes of such attitudes. Indeed, such analysis is necessary if we are to take positive steps designed to overcome these attitudes on the part of the public. Some of the probable causes of these attitudes may be found in the following:

1. Lack of a positive personnel program in governmental jurisdictions which provide the following:
    - (a) A career system which provides continuity in governmental employment.
    - (b) A program of promotions based on individual merit.
    - (c) A workable grievance procedure which insures the employee an opportunity to be heard on matters affecting his employment without fear of reprisal.
    - (d) An employee information program which keeps the employee up to date on matters of interest and which affect his work.
    - (e) A pay plan which provides equitable rates of pay internally and pay increases based on meritorious performance.
    - (f) A public information program which continually brings before the public the positive aspects of governmental employment.
2. Lack of competitive rates of pay. Some of the contributing factors for being below the "going rate" for pay in governmental jurisdictions are:
    - (a) The general lag in the budget function. In some jurisdictions it is necessary to project budgets over a two-year period. Budget preparation usually begins nine months to a year prior to the effective date of the budgets, making a total projection of two years, nine months to three years. In an expanding economy with soaring rates of pay in both the

private and public sectors, changes take place so rapidly that rates of pay are below the "going rate" almost before the date the budget is made effective.

(b) An expanding economy and increases in rates of pay both in the private and the public sectors which have made it necessary for governmental agencies to request increases in their salary budgets in an attempt to remain competitive. It appears that many elected officials are reluctant to appropriate funds necessary to bring rates of pay in the public sector up to a competitive level with the private sector because increases in taxes are necessary to provide the funds.

(c) Poor fringe benefit programs are another factor in the "total compensation package" offered by governmental jurisdictions. More and more the lack of competitive fringe benefit programs are a factor in attracting qualified applicants. This, coupled with the subcompetitive rates of pay, compounds the problem of the public administrator.

(d) The "watchdog" attitude reflected in press reporting, in my opinion, contributes to a negative attitude both on the part of the public and elected officials in providing competitive rates of pay. The recent listing of all salaries of $12,000 and above may well produce a negative reaction on the part of taxpayers who are making less than the amounts listed and feel that they are required to pay higher taxes to support these salaries.

3. The role of the press in serving as "watchdogs" on the public purse and champions of good government is commendable in their intent, but they contribute greatly to the problem of the public official responsible for recruiting well-qualified personnel for governmental jurisdictions. While it is recognized that it is certainly not their intent to create a negative attitude toward public employment, I submit that the reporting process tends to create a negative attitude toward public employment in the minds of readers.

Now that I have presented the problem areas to service in the public section and reasons why these problems exist, the final task is to offer some solution to these areas. It may be presumptuous on my part to offer cures for an ill that has baffled many an expert and which is currently involving many state organizations throughout all of the United States. However, four suggestions come to mind that, while they might not solve the problems, would certainly go far to alleviate some of our ills and at least take a step in the right direction. They are:

1. Creation of an agency within the jurisdiction to establish progressive personnel program environment encompassing the team concept between participating agencies of government.

2. Initiation of a public relations program to change the public image of public service, including establishment of competitive rates of pay and employment conditions. The agencies can begin in this area by informing the Legislature of the needs of public employees in advance of the legislative session and by preplanning and processing budget requests so that opposing viewpoints are resolved prior to such presentation.

3. Inauguration of a new concept of the training and manpower development

program which is essential to adequately staff key positions in the public service.

4. Provision of the means, both in personnel and in money, so that the personnel agency can effectively function and operate.

These are the minimum steps that need to be acted upon. They will provide a start to more effective recruitment and utilization of manpower in the public service.

Paper presented by
Hervey A. Juris
Assistant Professor of Labor Education School for Workers
The University of Wisconsin, Madison

The program announcing this workshop on "Manpower Problems in Public Employment" indicates that the public personnel official's job is complicated not only by the increasing difficulty of recruiting and retaining a sufficient number of qualified individuals for the public service in an extremely tight labor market, but also by the fact that he must learn to cope with union entry into the public sector at the same time. In this paper I will take the position that it is indeed difficult for the public personnel official to learn to cope with the union, but that it is probably less difficult than a frantic public would believe; that in point of fact, dealing with the union may even ease his other problems: recruitment, retention, and reward.

It seems to me that the biggest drawback facing us today with respect to learning to deal with unionism in the public sector is an irrational fear of, and inordinate amount of attention to, the possibility of strikes. Many legislators in this country seem determined to write some form of "effective" antistrike legislation. This emphasis on strikes is unfortunate for we are in danger of missing the point that strikes are only a symptom of unrest and not a cause. Regardless of legal prohibitions, public employees if sufficiently provoked are going to strike. The 1967 New York City teachers' strike, the 1968 sanitation workers' strike in New York City, and the strike of the Negro sanitation workers in Memphis—all in direct contravention of the law—are only the most recent examples in a long line of incidents.

Thirty years ago in the private sector we realized that employees will strike for such things as recognition of their union, the right to bargain collectively, a system of grievance resolution, and union security. Today we are at a point where in many jurisdictions we are refusing to make similar concessions to public employees and at the same time marveling that these people are becoming militant. Their motives are not different from those in the private sector.

Why did the private sector employees seek collective bargaining? Workers were at a distinct disadvantage when dealing with their employers. Many employers were taking advantage of their superior position by paying low wages, insisting on long hours of work, and refusing to deal with legitimate grievances. Workers learned that there is strength in numbers and that their economic interests were best served by dealing with the employer on a collective rather than on an individual basis. They wanted a voice in the determination of wages, hours, and conditions. They did not accept the idea of employer autonomy in all matters. They wanted a fair and equitable means of redressing grievances relating to the employment relationship, and they believed that the fulfillment of the ideal of democracy called for worksite as well as political democracy.

Federal labor legislation has supported them in their efforts to attain these goals and today millions of workers are organized into trade unions and bargain collectively with their employers. Furthermore, the overwhelming majority of contracts are settled peacefully without resort to strikes and lockouts; living standards of American workers have increased appreciably in the last thirty years; and industrial democracy and a measure of job security have been achieved.

Public employees are not blind. They see what has been happening in the private sector and they have seen the value of the traditional advantages of public employment such as some measure of prestige, job security, and a guaranteed wage eroded at the same time. In the United States today their job security is in many instances matched in the private sector. Furthermore the demand for skilled workers is so strong at this time that it is possible for many to leave the municipal payroll and improve themselves in a private sector job. Public employees falling behind in the area of wages and conditions can now, unlike in the past, do something about it. It is actually possible today to "quit if you don't like it here."

However, many do not want to quit. They feel a sense of pride in being municipal employees. They feel that they are making an important contribution to the society where they are now; however, they no longer feel that they have to do it at a personal sacrifice. Public employees, like private sector employees, want to have some voice in determining their conditions of employment. Many of these workers believe that collective bargaining is the most efficient and democratic means of accomplishing this objective. Workers in public employment, like those in private industry, expect to share in the economic gains being experienced throughout our economy. Public employees feel the need of an effective spokesman to protect and advance their job interests. They feel that their goals can be accomplished through organization, and through the mechanism of collective bargaining. The employees are appealing to the unions as much if not more than the unions are going after the employees.

This message was clearly transmitted to the mayors of the cities of the United States at their 1967 annual conference by Jerry Wurf, President of the American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees.

> Some observers glance at the statistics of employment, slide to union membership totals, and conclude that organized labor had crested in the major industries and was turning avariciously toward public employees, hungry for the per capita dues that would flow in upon their capture. Whether or not this is true, the important thing is that it is irrelevant. Unions would be unable to sign up a single employee if he were satisfied, if his dignity were not offended, if he were treated with justice. What is important is not the motives of union officials in organizing public employees, but the astonishing rapidity and success of their efforts. Barren ground yields poor crops. But here the ground was fertile beyond belief. . . . You—the mayors—represent our best organizers, our most persuasive reason for existence, our

2

> defense against membership apathy and indifference, our perpetual prod to militancy, and our assurance of continued growth.[1]

Professor Jack Barbash of the University of Wisconsin put it more succinctly when he said that employers organize workers; legislation only provides the unions with a hunting license.

Government employment has increased 3.5 million from 1955 to 1966 and will grow another 5 million to 15 million by 1976. State and local employment accounts for approximately three-fourths of this and the federal sector is expected to remain relatively stable in the future as the state and local sectors grow. In the last ten years public employee union membership has grown by 60 per cent to a current 1.5 million. The two fastest-growing unions in the municipal sphere have been the AFSCME (99,000 in 1955 to 400,000 today) and the AFT (46,500 to 135,000 over the same period).[2] Still to be organized are nurses, police, welfare workers and other municipal professionals; and we can expect continued growth in the traditional areas. The situation could grow desperate unless municipal management is willing to draw the obvious conclusion; i.e., the organization of public employees into groups seeking collective bargaining of the employment relationship is inevitable. The time has come for public employers to accept unionization, to accept collective bargaining, and to seek competence in this area just as they seek competence in the other areas of managerial responsibility with which they are charged.

It seems clear that the roots of difficulty and misunderstanding are institutionalized in the system. On the municipal employer side we are speaking of jurisdictions ranging in size from 10,000 to over 1,000,000 (forgetting all the smaller jurisdictions). This range encompasses municipal governments which range from one or two full-time officials plus a large group of part-time officials to large-scale bureaucracies whose members have honed the art of government to its finest edge; and in terms of bargaining experience we are talking about a range which includes at one end the rawest recruits who are uninformed, defensive and in some cases frightened, and at the other end includes the smoothest of professionals who can give any union a hard fight on terms the union understands.

Regardless of their experience or the size of their jurisdictions, municipal employers must cope with two structural problems which complicate their bargaining task. The first of these problems lies in the fact that while personnel matters are an executive responsibility, the power to allocate funds lies with the legislative branch. This arrangement introduces obvious political problems into an already tense situation and places greater demands on the municipal executive than on his private sector counterpart. The second structural problem involves the question of bargaining units. A multiplicity of unions dealing with one management compete with one another for favorable settlements regardless of any differential environmental factors which might exist.

Picture a plant organized on the European model where an individual may join any union of his choice and management may have to deal with three or four unions in one shop. Put this in the context of the American industrial relations system where the employer bargains collectively on a plant-wide basis. With luck each union would be willing to bargain in a group with the others. However, each might want to bargain separately and still get the same package as the others. This latter model is municipal bargaining today. Transit workers, teachers, police, fire, welfare, public works, and craft workers are all organized separately and often want to bargain separately. Management then must not only reach an economically sound settlement but must do so while in some way attending to the political needs of the leadership of each of the organizations with whom it deals.

---

[1] *Government Employee Relations Report,* No. 198, June 26, 1967, p. D-3.

[2] "Where Should Unionism End," *Wisconsin State Journal,* April 14, 1967, p. 12.

The wide range of experience and competence is mirrored on the union side as well. For example, the AFSCME and the AFT are national organizations with research departments to provide data, education departments to teach local bargainers how to use it, and international representatives to bargain for the locals and/or aid them on a full-time basis. Then there is the International Association of Fire Fighters which has a combination research and education director to service all the locals and has just appointed its first full-time international representative. Finally there are the police associations which are national only in the minority, which have not seen bargaining as their prime function, some of whom do provide information but no education in how to use it, and who have no international representatives.

As we said previously, all this means a big change for the public employer: joint decision-making where before there was fiat, and accountability for decisions previously considered within the sovereign's discretion. In short, accustomed to absolute authority to accompany absolute responsibility, he must now share the authority while remaining totally responsible for the results. One way to look at this is as a total readjustment; another more realistic one is to consider that time has finally caught up with the public employer and that his job, like the job of his private sector counterpart, is finally fully defined.

Thirty years of experience in the private sector should convince the prudent manager that opposition to this trend would be not only costly in the short run in terms of disruption, ill will, and an unnecessary drain on his time, but also in the long run since the time might have been better spent mastering the new responsibility in conjunction with the organization representing his employees. In jurisdictions where there is enabling legislation, some significant obstacles have been overcome. In these jurisdictions there has been a measure of acceptance of collective bargaining and the emphasis has been on defining a smooth relationship. This is the same process that has been going on in the private sector since 1935.

It would be instructive at this time to consider the Wisconsin experience. In 1961 the Wisconsin Legislature passed in its current form the municipal employment bargaining law.[3] It gave to the Wisconsin Employment Relations Commission the jurisdiction to enforce this law in the same manner that the National

---

[3] Wisconsin Statutes: Chapter 111—Employment Relations; Subchapter IV—Right of Public Employees to Organize or Join Labor Organizations and Relating to Bargaining in Municipal Employment.

Labor Relations Board is the arbiter of the National Labor Relations Act—subject to review by the courts.[4] The law provides for unit determination and selection of a bargaining agent under procedures established by the WERC. There are prohibited practices for employers and employee organizations with respect to the coercion of an employee in the exercise of his rights to join in concerted action or to refrain. The law does not spell out the duty to bargain. It leaves the determination of mandatory and permissive subjects of bargaining to the parties subject to WERC review, and it provides for mediation and advisory arbitration (fact finding) in lieu of strikes which are prohibited, but not penalized. While we do not know how many municipal contracts have been successfully negotiated in Wisconsin, we do know that the impasse resolution machinery has been relatively successful with only seventy-three petitions for fact finding in the first three years and only twenty-eight fact-finding proceedings where mediation failed to resolve the dispute.[5] Furthermore there have only been ten strikes since 1961, none of which was long in duration, and most of which can be traced to inexperience with the bargaining process and a refusal to understand the meaning of bargaining in good faith. This is a most remarkable accomplishment, and a great deal of credit for the lack of militancy in Wisconsin public sector collective bargaining must go to the parties who have accepted the spirit as well as the letter of the law and to the expertise of the WERC which has actively lent its good offices at all stages of the process when requested.

Refusal to recognize employee organizations and/or refusal to bargain only postpones the inevitable and delays the beginning of the process of accommodation. Recognition and bargaining, however, do not automatically cause discontent and the symptoms of unrest to disappear. A look at the developing labor-management relationship in the protective services provides us with an opportunity to analyze some recent experience.[6]

We mentioned earlier that while strikes are prohibited to public employees almost everywhere in the country, this does not erase the possibility that public employees are going to strike. 1966-67 will have to go down in the annals of collective bargaining history as the year that the protective services ignored Calvin Coolidge's time-honored and oft-repeated injunction at the time of the 1919 Boston Police Strike, "There is no right to strike against the public safety by anybody, anywhere, anytime." The Firefighters who have a no-strike clause in the international union constitution had strikes in Atlanta, Georgia, St. Louis and Kansas City, Missouri. At its 1966 convention the union appointed a bipartisan panel of highly qualified individuals to reappraise the no-strike provision and report to the 1968 convention.[7] Among police there have been a number of mass sick calls. The so-called "Blue Flu" struck Detroit, Michigan, Youngstown, Ohio, Pontiac, Michigan, Struthers, Ohio, and Lockport, Illinois, while strikes were threatened in Milwaukee, Wisconsin, and Portsmouth, Toledo, and Canton, Ohio. Police picket lines in Cranston, Rhode Island, moreover, stopped construction on three new school buildings. Critics of collective bargaining for the protective services claim that this militance is inherent in the bargaining process and conclude that the protective services represent a special case and should be excluded from unionization.

---

[4] The WERC, however, unlike the NLRB does not prosecute. It has no function similar to the office of the General Counsel.

[5] Ten cases were pending at the time the data were compiled. James L. Stern, "The Wisconsin Public Employee Fact-Finding Procedure," *Industrial and Labor Relations Review*, October, 1966, pp. 3-29.

[6] We could have also examined labor-management relations in the education system or the health services and arrived at the same results. However, police and fire bargaining have attracted less attention to date and so are considered here.

In order to provide some concrete examples of how these issues can be seen from more than one point of view, it is helpful to look at four specific objections to collective bargaining in the protective services and to consider some counter arguments to each of the objections.

Objection —While strikes are generally felt to be unconscionable in public sector bargaining, the protective services are the most essential of all presumably essential services and therefore strikes here are totally unthinkable.

Other Considerations—Obviously strikes cannot be tolerated in the protective services. Therefore we should direct attention to procedures for preventing them, such as union recognition, participation in bargaining, teaching the meaning and techniques of good faith, and providing alternative mechanisms, because unless we do strikes will occur. Attitude is important; mediation and fact finding, the most commonly proposed alternative mechanisms to a strike, are predicated on the supposition that the parties have been bargaining in good faith and have reached an honest impasse which both desire to resolve. All of this of course implies that we have already provided enabling legislation providing for recognition and the duty to bargain along with the necessary protections and guarantees.

Objection —Because strikes and unions are equated by many becoming involved in the field of labor-management relations for the first time, unions for the protective services are considered something to be avoided at best. As a minimum it is felt that a protective service union should be restricted to enrolling members from that service only. The IAFF as an established institution is accepted despite its AFL-CIO affiliation. Police unions on the other hand are prohibited in many places and police associations tolerated.

Other Considerations—Arguments against unionization for the protective services, especially the police, are outdated (having largely appeared before the rise of public employee unionism generally) and seem to have little proven basis in fact. The argument for municipal sovereignty has been rejected *de facto* and by the courts; the fear of unions expressed in the literature opposed to police and fire unions has been dispelled by experience and exposure: unionism does not mean the *closed* shop; bargaining does not inevitably lead to strikes. In the police strikes and strike threat situations discussed above, only the Lockport, Illinois, strike involved a union (and its charter was revoked by the International). All the other groups were police-only professional associations. The argument for restricting unions to one service only with no outsiders loses force, especially with respect to the police, when we consider that this is presumably done so that police won't become partial to other unionists and so that they will be neutral in labor strife; yet we let both policemen and firemen moonlight—that is, take a second job—and join the union which has jurisdiction in the industry in which they moonlight. What is the difference?

---

[7] "Firemen Study No-Strike Clause," *New York Times*, December 29, 1966, p. 18.

Objection —Is the professionalization toward which police and firefighters are striving compatible with unionization? Unionism is associated with manual laborers and considered a working class institution.

Other Considerations—To the extent that collective bargaining has permitted municipalities to raise entry salaries in the protective services, to the extent that it has at least in Wisconsin led to the negotiation of education incentive plans, and to the extent that it may have broken the police-firefighter salary parity stranglehold, the bargaining process has contributed rather than detracted from professionalization. As Harold Howe II, Commissioner of Education, said at the 1966 convention of the American Federation of Teachers, you are not a professional because you call yourself one, but rather because other people treat you as one.[8]

Objection —Are the quasi-military nature of the protective services and collective bargaining, which requires joint decision-making, compatible with one another?

Other Considerations—The quasi-military nature of the protective services does not have to preclude collective bargaining. Sharing of responsibility in the negotiation of new terms and conditions should not affect discipline but may improve morale. The grievance procedure is concerned with the interpretation of the contract, and is easily distinguished from the authority of superior officers in matters concerning the conduct of the department during emergencies. We should be careful to remember that these are quasi-military and *not* military services. The members are still civilians.

---

[8] American Federation of Teachers, *Convention Proceedings (Abridged); Fifteenth Annual Convention—1966* (reproduced by the international union in offset form), p. 108.

In summary, unnecessary unrest in the municipal sector can be avoided if the parties will recognize certain well accepted concepts developed in the private sector. Collective bargaining is a desirable state of affairs because it will allow a sense of dignity to the public employee who has long felt that he has been reduced to collective begging, and it will allow him to participate in decisions affecting his employment status on the same basis as his private sector counterpart. To eliminate the possibility of wildcat strikes during the term of the contract, we ought to provide for third-party binding arbitration of grievances in the public sector. Both mediation and some form of advisory arbitration should be provided for the resolution of disputes over the terms of a new agreement. However, we should realize that none of the above recommendations is going to work unless both parties come to the bargaining table with a genuine desire to bargain in good faith. Collective bargaining for municipal employees is the wave of the future; municipalities can get on the surfboard of good faith and ride with it or be stubborn and drown.

Paper presented by
Donald Wasserman
Director of Education
American Federation of State, County, and Municipal Employees
Washington, D.C.

Our theme today is quite simple. Depending upon the governmental jurisdiction involved, public employee unionism is either a present reality or will be in the very near future.

Public management recognizes this. All too frequently, however, managers are determined to take no positive action in dealing with a union unless obligated by law or forced by muscle. It is as though they feel that any move they take to recognize or deal with the union would be a wrong move.

This situation is illustrated by an incident that allegedly took place on the maiden flight of the intercontinental Boeing 707. The plane was fully loaded with passengers and crew. All was in apparent readiness for the take-off. The pilot's voice was then heard over the loud speaker system. He said that indeed this was the maiden voyage of the Boeing 707, the plane had been fully tested and approved by the FAA. He further announced that the plane cost in the neighborhood of $6 million, that it weighed several thousand tons, that they would be flying at an altitude of 35,000 feet at a cruising speed of approximately 700 miles per hour. In the unlikely event that any problems should develop, there are oxygen masks overhead and the stewardess will demonstrate their proper use. Because part of the flight will be made over water, there are life rafts under your seats, and the stewardess will demonstrate their proper use. The pilot concluded his remarks with the statement, "As soon as I get my guts up, we will get this plane off the ground."

This attitude, I think, accurately reflects the thinking of some of our public officials with respect to collective bargaining for public employees. As soon as we get our nerve up, we will get off the ground.

I think it fair to give those of you who are public managers some ideas of what to expect from this union if the employees over which you have direction have the foresight to select AFSCME as their bargaining representative.

You can, in a word, expect hard collective bargaining. This can be best put in perspective by drawing analogies to collective bargaining in the "private sector." But the situation is completely different, some will argue. Even if there is to be collective bargaining for public employees, you cannot look to private industry for guidelines; rather, a completely new system will evolve, they say.

My reaction to this is that collective bargaining, be it public or private, is a continuously evolving process. The key word here is *process*—a process providing for bilateral decision-making. Collective bargaining within the private sector is not monolithic. It takes different shapes and forms according to the nature of the industry or company, area, economic conditions, and the workforce. Collective bargaining on the waterfront is considerably different than it is in electrical manufacturing. It takes one form in construction and another in utilities. Collective bargaining for public employees will simply be another form of the same art. It will be, and in fact has been, evolving and taking shape over a period of several years. At least, insofar as state and local employees are concerned, public employee collective bargaining will be largely indistinguishable from much of the bargaining that now takes place in our private economy. Unilateral decision-making will be replaced by bilateral agreement.

Years ago, it was relatively easy to clearly distinguish between private sector and public sector functions. These distinctions have become blurred with the passage of time and the expansion of government into new areas of involvement.

In education, we are witnessing the dual growth of both public and private schools. This is also true in higher education where even private universities receive tremendous appropriations, grants, and research money from federal and state governments. We note the existence of privately owned and publicly owned transportation companies serving the same population. Public and private hospitals largely perform the same services. This list is by no means exhaustive. We can all think of other examples.

Perhaps, if Mr. O'Brien had remained at the Post Office Department long enough, we may have witnessed a variation on the theme. You will recall that the Postmaster General was advocating private management of a public institution. This concept is by no means unique. Our neighbor, Canada, uses the term, Crown Corporation, to describe a public institution which is privately managed—such as Air Canada.

The relevance here is twofold: Increasingly, the same functions are being performed by public and private industry employees. And increasingly, public employees are unwilling to be told they are a group apart, a group that because of the nature of their work, cannot have a decisive voice in determining the conditions under which they will work.

It is in this context that we should discuss recent developments in public service and our views concerning what is and should be happening in public employment labor relations. Currently there are more than nine million state and local government employees in the United States. The inclusion of federal government employees, raises the total to almost approximately twelve million public employees. Within a few years, state and local government employment alone will reach over eleven million.

During the twenty-year period, 1947-1967, private industry nonagricultural employment increased roughly two-fifths (41 per cent). During this period total government employment more than doubled (112 per cent increase), while state and local government employment alone jumped 145 per cent. The majority of new jobs currently created are in the public sector.

Considerable discussion concerning the government's role as "an employer of last resort" has added another dimension to the labor relations "problem," and may provide even further growth in public employment.

Now let's take a look at the public employee. Thirty years ago, jobs in public employment were much sought after because of the security they provided and the fact that private industry jobs were just not available. Frequently public employees willingly worked for lower wages than their counterparts in private agencies because of the security attached to public employment. Today the situation is considerably different. The labor market has been a relatively tight one. Workers, be they public or private, are not nearly as insecure as formerly. Job security is no longer the overriding factor that it was. Public employees have become increasingly more interested in wages–*NOW*. They want parity with private employees–and at least of equal importance, they want a measure of dignity and justice on the job that can only be achieved collectively.

And the simple fact is, that public employees are no longer looking toward Civil Service systems to provide the equity that they seek. Instead they are demanding a voice in their own destiny and organizing themselves into militant, effective unions.

Workers and their unions view Civil Service in its proper light, the personnel arm of the public employer. We do not see it as an independent third party. Public employees, unlike public management, do not confuse the merit principle with the merit system. We agree with the merit principle: employees should be selected and retained on the basis of merit. But we want a voice in effectuating this principle.

Generally, we think of Civil Service as the recruiting arm of government and that agency which is responsible for initial employment based upon merit. It also stands for aspects of personnel management far removed from the merit principle –for unilateral determination of wages, hours, and other conditions of employment, including fringe benefits. Civil Service also means unilateral determination of workers' appeals concerning disciplinary action, discrimination, discharges, and the resolution of a variety of grievances. And, most importantly, the Civil Service Board is appointed by and beholden to the public employer, be he mayor, county commissioner, governor, or president. The final arbiter, thus, is still the boss.

Obviously, this is not the answer to labor relations problems in public employment. The answer, we firmly believe, is full-scope collective bargaining.

The underpinning of such collective bargaining in the public sector should be a collective bargaining law for public employees passed at the state level to be uniformly applicable to state, county, and municipal employees. Such legislation should state clearly the right of public employees to organize and to join unions of their own choosing. The law should be administered by an independent tripartite board. The public employer should not appoint its own labor board which will determine issues such as appropriate bargaining units, certification elections, representation rights, and unfair labor practices. Like the National Labor Relations Board, a public employment labor board should be truly independent. A good collective bargaining law should provide for exclusive representation rights no matter whether the bargaining unit be all employees in a city or merely part of one department. There should be only one union representing the employees. There should be no bargaining rights for minority unions. Dual unionism simply does not work.

Most importantly, adequate collective bargaining legislation for public employees must clearly provide for broad-scope collective bargaining. Wages and other important conditions of employment must be bargainable items. This, of course, does not mean management surrender.

There has been broad-scope collective bargaining in the private sector for over thirty years. Private management has not given up its right to manage the grocery store or the railroad. The steel workers do not run the steel industry and the auto workers do not manage General Motors. Yet these parties bargain about all kinds of subjects that affect wages, hours, and working conditions. If management, public or private, deems certain aspects of the employee-employer relationship as sacred, they can protect their interests best at the bargaining table. They need not have prerogatives written into the law. It is worth noting that the recently published *Report of the Task Force on State and Local Government Labor Relations of the National Governors Conference* stated that ". . . a strong and experienced management should be able to protect itself at the bargaining table without jeopardizing the principle of collective bargaining."

It would be an empty gesture for the legislature or public management to grant collective bargaining rights on the one hand, and at the same time virtually withdraw them by severely limiting their scope. Public employees will not accept this kind of shell game. The parties must have the same freedom to resolve all problems relating to wages, hours and working conditions as exists in the private sector.

We also reject the idea that Civil Service rules or regulations can remove matters concerning wages, hours, and working conditions from the scope of bargaining. We intend to negotiate on subject matter which, in many jurisdictions, is now covered by such regulations. There is no legitimate reason why a public management should be permitted to hide behind such regulations and refuse to bargain about such subjects as vacation, holidays, sick leave, overtime, shift differential, and the like. These should be bargainable issues and they will be.

Public employees will no longer accept the evasive answer that they are knocking at the wrong door—that they cannot improve their vacation plan through collective bargaining—that they must go to the state legislature or the city council. We want to solve our problems at only one place—the bargaining table. For our part, we agree that any subject within the scope of collective bargaining should be finally settled at the bargaining table. If, for example, we want to increase the number of holidays from nine to ten, and fail to do so as a result of give-and-take collective bargaining, we will not run around management negotiators or appeal over their heads to the legislature. We will live with the decisions made at the bargaining table.

Public management, long accustomed to making unilateral decisions, is deeply concerned about the extent to which unions will participate in the decision-making process outside of the typical "bread and butter" issues. Will collective bargaining touch upon areas related to the "mission of the agency?" Frankly, this question is difficult to answer theoretically or in the abstract. Certainly, many teacher groups want to negotiate on subjects such as the number of students per class. Similarly, social workers may want to negotiate about case load and their relationship to clients. In the eyes of the professional employee, these are indeed proper subjects for collective bargaining. In many other bargaining units similar concepts or matters will not be negotiated.

You may be certain, however, that this union will want to negotiate on the impact or consequences of management decisions as they affect the employer-employee relationship with respect to wages, hours, and other conditions of employment. Here again, a parallelism may be drawn with similar situations in private industry. UAW, for example, does not bargain with General Motors as to the amount, make, or model of the automobiles that will be produced. GM's decisions on these matters directly affect working conditions. Consequently the Auto Workers do negotiate when they are displeased with the speed of the assembly line, which is related to the "mix" of models coming down the line. In fact, these disputes about production standards occasionally result in strikes.

The point here, of course, is not to suggest strike action but to point out the critical nature of some management decisions and their impact upon working conditions. A union must be able to negotiate on these matters and collective bargaining legislation must permit such negotiations.

What other matters should collective bargaining legislation cover? Two very important items from our point of view are the checkoff of union dues and the question of union security. We do not ask that collective bargaining legislation specifically direct that all unions be granted checkoff or that union security should be automatic. We do, however, maintain that legislation should expressly authorize the parties to negotiate on these subjects—that is, the public employer should not be prohibited from agreeing to dues checkoff or a union security clause. At the very least, management would be obligated to negotiate (not to agree) on these topics. We also believe that checkoff should be permitted only for the majority union. It should be denied to minority organizations.

Legislation should expressly authorize the parties to negotiate and agree to a full-fledged grievance procedure, providing for final and binding arbitration of unresolved disputes by a neutral third party, as the terminal step in the grievance procedure.

I think that this should give you some clear ideas about the aspirations of public employees, in general, and the goals of this union, in particular. In short, we identify completely with the concept of collective bargaining as manifested in private industry.

The marvelous thing about the collective bargaining process is its flexibility and adaptability to various circumstances and conditions, as well as its response to change.

Some of you may recall that about five or six years ago it was the vogue in liberal-intellectual circles to write off collective bargaining as a failure. Indeed, several obituaries were written, and probably at rather fancy prices. Today most would agree that collective bargaining is still a vital process. And, to paraphrase one of the irreverent slogans of the day, "Collective bargaining is alive and well"; it is entering the public sector.

Workshop 4

LABOR AND MANAGEMENT RESPONSIBILITIES FOR THE EMPLOYMENT OF THE DISADVANTAGED AND MINORITY GROUPS

Remarks by Workshop Moderator Irving Kovarsky
Professor, Department of Business Administration
College of Business Administration
The University of Iowa

No one area in the total manpower spectrum has received more attention than that area pertaining to how the disadvantaged and minority groups may be gainfully employed in our society. To discuss this problem, this workshop heard first from Charles W. Toney of the Management Development Department, John Deere and Company, Moline, Illinois. He discussed in detail the efforts of John Deere to employ white-collar supervisory or technical Negro employees. He spoke in detail about the John Deere philosophy regarding discrimination against Negroes and other ethnic groups. He related how John Deere affiliated with the "Plans for Progress Program" to employ the disadvantaged. They initiated an organization to fight discrimination, "The Quad-City Merit Employment Council," which now has membership of thirty-three companies.

He also spoke on one of the major problems facing employers—how to reach the minorities, or, in Mr. Toney's words, how to establish for minorities "believability" in American corporations. He detailed how John Deere sought to accomplish this through job opportunity centers, civil rights conferences, distribution of booklets to high schools, and recruiting at predominantly Negro colleges.

In addition, he related how Deere devised training programs, both for the disadvantaged and for first-line and middle-management personnel, to acquaint them with the problems peculiar to hiring minority groups. Mr. Toney suggested that similar programs must be undertaken by every employer in order to achieve fair employment. He suggested that employers actively seek blacks, as did John Deere and Ford Motor Company, by advertising fair employment opportunities and conducting training for key supervisory employees to emphasize official company policy. He also suggested that companies must establish realistic objectives, taking into consideration what they might expect of their black employees, recognizing the negative impact of the ghetto-type environment and rancor toward the white built up over more than a hundred years. There is a need, consequently, for special concessions and an appreciation of the difficulty of solving this long-term problem.

The second speaker was Robert McGlotten, Civil Rights Department, AFL-CIO, Washington, D.C. Mr. McGlotten, while not rationalizing labor's position on civil rights, analyzed the situation from the labor union's position and realistically evaluated the attack on the problem made by the labor movement. He joined with Mr. Toney in emphasizing that not only is job training needed, but, because of the lack of work experience of minorities, much more needs to be done to help these people, more so than whites, develop proper work habits and assume their rightful position in industry. And, as Mr. Toney mentioned, Mr. McGlotten emphasized the need for training not only the people involved but also those in supervisory positions.

He mentioned the role the federal government should assume as the employer of last resort; more people must face reality and recognize that the federal government must play an important role in this area.

Mr. McGlotten also emphasized the fact that the Negro male needed to develop an improved image of his own worth. Due to humiliating experiences over the years, he has downgraded his abilities. The black now realizes that fair employment cannot be separated from the need for improved housing, schooling, and a sense of belonging. Since the problem of Negro employment is essentially a big-city problem, the city environment is most important.

Finally, Mr. McGlotten expressed concern that too much attention was being paid to the radical Negro leaders and not enough publicity was given to the moderate Negroes who more accurately reflect leadership in the ghetto.

Following the two presentations, there was an interesting question and answer period. Concerning the U.S. Employment Service, Mr. McGlotten remarked that the Negro has little faith in state employment agencies to provide relief, primarily because of the earlier practice of screening out applicants. Whether justified or not, blacks have little confidence in the USES; they despair whenever an antipoverty program is handled by this agency and consequently do not participate in these programs. When a member of the U.S. Employment Service questioned whether his position accurately reflected the black mood, Mr. McGlotten mentioned again that he was aware that some improvement had taken place, but the Negro must be convinced that the practices of the USES are not the same as in the past. Participation from the black community is necessary before USES programs can be successful.

The second area of discussion concerned testing as a condition of employment. After much discussion on the limitations of tests, the consensus seemed to be that tests to select employees are an imperfect device at best. The extensive and increased use of tests can be attributed to convincing salesmanship and the quest for a "scientific" approach; that a score on an examination of this type reflects background is too often ignored. The Negro ghetto "invents" language, a language that is foreign to the middle-class white. If the same examination is given to him in ghetto language, his score may improve. Besides raw test scores as a hindrance to employment, a major concern is whether there is any correlation between results of tests and ability to perform the job.

The third area discussed dealt with those physically incapable of working. Mr. Toney felt the company must insist that job applicants pass medical examinations, if for no other reason than to keep insurance rates within reason. He advocated government aid to the sick and disabled and/or government-established medical and health centers. To protect firms hiring the physically disadvantaged, Mr.

Toney felt the government could provide some kind of cushion, perhaps in the form of a tax advantage or by making up the differences in insurance increases.

The final discussion dealt with the hiring of disadvantaged employees at lower grades of pay. While people in the ghetto need jobs, the discussants felt that pride and hope were also essential. People holding jobs at lower rates of pay will continue to regard themselves as second-class citizens. The panelists felt that the profit of the corporation need not be impaired if the disadvantaged are employed in meaningful occupations at the rates of pay given to everyone.

In summary, the participants in this workshop focused attention on practical solutions to the problem of hiring the disadvantaged from the viewpoint of the company and from the union. The discussion period touched on such diverse topics as testing, hiring the disabled and providing meaningful job opportunities. Perhaps this pragmatic approach will help to stimulate interest in solving some of our most pressing manpower problems of today.

Paper presented by
Charles W. Toney
Management Development, Deere and Company
Moline, Illinois

The recent assassination of Dr. Martin Luther King, Jr., has polarized American opinion at the moment. I hope I am correct in my evaluation that the majority of citizens are no longer content with remaining silent and now by their actions are dedicating themselves to Dr. King's dream of creating a society of brotherhood where men of different colors and religions can live and work together in peace. The rioting, burning, and pillaging by Negroes immediately after the King assassination has given the white racists fodder to feed the mills of hate. Recommendations from this sector of our society seem ludicrous if there were not modern precedents for pogroms: for example, the extermination of the Jews in Germany, the concentration camps for Americans of Japanese ancestry, and the confinement of Indians to reservations. The immediate crisis has generated positive action from all sectors of our society. My discussion of management's responsibility for the employment of the disadvantaged and minority groups will predate the King assassination and had its birth long before anyone heard of Rap Brown or Stokely Carmichael.

By accident of birth I feel qualified to discuss stereotypes. Minorities have not been the only segment of our society that have been stereotyped and misrepresented as unsavory citizens. Some years ago the businessman was depicted as a money-making machine with dollar signs for eyeballs, an adding machine for a brain, and a ticker tape for a heart. Even college professors have provided material for cartoonists. Business and industry is not all brick, mortar, products, and profits. It is operated by people who have some social conscience and contribute their time to make this a better world to live in. The number one domestic problem of our day is the race problem. Discrimination against Negroes and other ethnic groups with pigmentation has been well documented; Negroes have listed their grievances as unemployment and underemployment, inferior education, and inadequate segregated housing. Deere and Company has made a contribution to resolving these problems in all of the above areas, but I would like to discuss primarily the area of equal employment opportunities.

Deere and Company's philosophy can best be described by remarks made by Frank Dickey, Vice-President, Industrial Relations and Personnel, at the Governors' Conference on Nondiscrimination in Employment, Peoria, Illinois, July 30, 1964:

> Several years ago, some of us decided the time had come when we had to face this matter of discrimination squarely. We made a realistic appraisal of its existence and its effects. When this had been done, we found that some of our practices were not consistent with the kind of company we wanted to be and with the kind of personnel policies we wanted to follow. It was decided that it wasn't enough to take a passive attitude in opposing discrimination. Positive action against it was needed.

I would like to discuss some of the positive action programs in which Deere and Company has participated.

Our Chief Executive Officer, Mr. William Hewitt, signed a Plan for Progress with President Lyndon B. Johnson, pledging this corporation to affirmative action programs for hiring, upgrading, and promoting minorities. We are an affiliate of Plans for Progress at the national level where 400 major businesses and industries representing nine million employees have voluntarily made an assault on bigotry.

In our community, Deere and Company initiated the organization of the Quad-City Merit Employment Council with a present membership of thirty-three Plans for Progress and non-Plans for Progress companies. Last year thirty-three local area high school counselors received two graduate credit hours for attending a Vocational Guidance Institute sponsored by the Quad-City Merit Employment Council and Plans for Progress. These institutes are designed to acquaint counselors with problems peculiar only to minorities.

Plans for Progress recommends the following steps as affirmative action:

1. Recruit and hire minority group members.
2. Contact Negro and other minority organizations.
3. Send policy statements to management personnel.
4. Advertise as an "equal opportunity employer."
5. Audit company equal employment programs.
6. Cooperate with other companies in establishing "believability" for minorities.

Deere and Company has complied with the above recommendations and initiated other programs of positive action when we felt we were not meeting our *own* objectives.

Our first programs were designed to establish "believability" for minorities. Forty-seven local area religious and civil leaders attended a conference at the administrative center and were informed of employment opportunities and our commitment to nondiscrimination.

For the same purpose of establishing "believability," four job opportunity centers were conducted in the minority neighborhoods for minority youth and their parents. In addition, we printed and distributed at the opportunity centers a booklet entitled *After High School, What?* This booklet contained information concerning employment opportunities in our company, where to apply at our unit locations, and guidelines on how to apply for employment, covering such areas as interviewing, filling out an application form, and how to dress. We have actively recruited at predominantly Negro colleges for six years. Three additional colleges were added to the 1967-1968 recruiting schedule, bringing the total to ten. Deere and Company prepared an Equal Opportunity at John Deere brochure and distributed this brochure on the campuses where we recruit. It was also placed on all predominantly Negro college campuses in America.

Every summer, production schedules permitting, we have two summer work programs for high school and college students—the Summer Employment Program (SEP) and the Student Trainee Program (STP). We hired sixteen minorities in these two programs for the summer of 1967.

The Management Development and Personnel Research Department, reporting to Mr. Dickey, has a basics and advanced program for manufacturing first-line and middle-management personnel. To date, 415 managers have participated in the programs. Included in the program is a discussion on personnel practices and our commitment to Plans for Progress. A natural follow-up is a discussion on minority problems. A one-hour session explains four basic problem areas of the Negro—family, education, achievement motivation, and peer-group pressures (better known as ghetto living).

Deere and Company is the largest employer in the state of Iowa. We have manufacturing units located in two cities that have the largest minority population—Des Moines and Waterloo. Management personnel at the John Deere Des Moines Works cooperated with other firms in establishing a Greater Des Moines Merit Employment Council. Civil rights and religious leaders were conferred with and informed of the objectives of the Council. Job Opportunity Centers were conducted in the disadvantaged neighborhoods. When Governor Hughes initiated a summer work program for the disadvantaged last year, Council members responded with money and jobs. Presently there is a program taking form for the employment of the unemployables in the Des Moines area. The planning was prior to the death of Martin Luther King.

John Deere has the largest tractor factory in the world located in Waterloo, Iowa, which has the highest percentage of Negro population in the state. Some of the positive action programs in the Waterloo factory conducted by management personnel have been a skills inventory of minority employees, a basic education program and an equal opportunity forum for employees conducted by Mr. James Hutchins, who has also worked closely with the school in establishing "believability" for minority students.

In this year of 1968 it is no longer daring to say you are for equal opportunity in employment. It now has the same respectability as motherhood and apple pie. If Deere and Company only wanted to comply with Title VII of the 1964 Civil Rights Act, they could showcase a couple of Negroes like myself, go through the motions of being physically present on Negro college campuses, train employment interviewers to be nice to Negroes—and consider the job well done. To fulfill our own commitments and carry out company philosophy concerning equality of opportunity, we are now applying the management-by-objectives principles to minority employment. We have set objectives, assigned priorities, and evaluated results.

I do not want you to draw conclusions that we have completely eliminated all forms of discrimination, but we are continually working to accomplish this goal. If this has sounded like a commercial or testimonial for John Deere, it was not my intent. Bell Telephone, Caterpillar Tractor Company, IBM, Bankers Life, Ford Motor Company, and a host of other major corporations have initiated programs of positive action. We exchange information and sometimes adopt those programs that are applicable in the areas of our operations.

If it is the intent of white America to assist the Negro to reach middle-class standards through equal job opportunities, let me remind you of the biblical phrase, "Man cannot live by bread alone." More bread (money) means a desire for adequate housing, equal educational facilities, humane treatment by law enforcement agencies, and a voice in decision-making bodies. This is the nitty gritty aspect of the race problem. Nothwithstanding profits, stockholders, other real or imagined fears, corporate executives have become involved in the total race problem. Arjay Miller of Ford Motor Company endorsed the negative income tax to replace welfarism. The President of General Motors testified before the Michigan Legislature favoring fair-housing legislation. Fifteen executives of major corporations including Mr. Hewitt of Deere and Company went on record for a federal fair-housing law. William Blackie, President of Caterpillar Tractor Company, spoke in favor of a fair-housing law before the Illinois Legislature. The recently formed National Alliance of Businessmen is addressing itself to the problem of employing the hard-core unemployed.

Most Americans of both races have been shocked and dismayed by the past summer of unprecedented discord and the riots following the King assassination. Yet the average citizen, preoccupied with his own problems and pressures, assumes that domestic tranquility is an inalienable right. There is a child-like disbelief that this land of the free, internally secure for a hundred years, may be confronted with strife and violence on a massive scale. Many mistakes have been made in the past, and there is enough blame for all to share. We have passed the point where recrimination and bitterness will solve problems. We must come to grips realistically with the gravest domestic problem of the century. The Kerner Report questions the assumption that we are fundamentally a decent and humane people. In spite of this negative assumption, I believe that America has the resources and our people have a compassion and desire to provide equal justice, adequate education, fair housing, and job opportunities for all. This we must surely do.

Paper presented by
Robert McGlotten
Civil Rights Department, AFL-CIO
Washington, D.C.

Change is the key word for society in the next ten years! There is a need for change. How can we tackle the problems of the ghetto? Of the hard-core unemployed and of the disadvantaged? One can scarcely imagine the lack of hope of those living in the ghetto. They have no family life comparable to those of middle-class America. A basic understanding of their situation is needed to appraise what needs to be done.

It is not just job training that is needed, because past experience has shown that the hard core and disadvantaged are suffering from much more than a lack of training in the traditional sense of the word. They are suffering from the non-experience of the world of work, reflected in such things as getting to work on time, putting in a full day's work, and assuming the responsibility and dedication to one's occupation that makes for a responsible worker.

In a production plant, management must take the initiative to insure that workers, particularly the hard core and disadvantaged, feel there is some pride in the occupation in which they are working and that they are productive in some essential part of that particular industry.

In the building trades area, the AFL-CIO Civil Rights Department, in cooperation with the Building Trades Department and building trades councils, have funded programs in some thirty-one major cities which are recruiting and preparing minority group youth as to the advantages of apprenticeship training which enables them to become journeymen in a skilled-craft area. It helps give them a sense of pride to look at a mound of dirt which in a period of a few months will become a beautiful physical structure and in which they will have played an important role in developing regardless of their occupation. Many of our affiliate international unions in the industrial area have also started training programs which are federally funded and do essentially the same thing—try to motivate these people. Among the unions involved are the Communication Workers, Steelworkers, International Union of Electrical Workers, Retail, Wholesale and Department Store Union, Building Service Employees, and many more.

The labor movement is trying at best to attack the problem of unemployment but is very limited in that they are not employers, rather only representatives of the employed. The state employment services have a much more meaningful role than they have accepted in the past. They have a credibility gap which must be overcome and they must stress a much broader role of the Negro in the skilled-craft areas rather than the white-collar jobs. The appeal by most of industry and of the employment service is to the white-collar-and-tie concept rather than the blue-collar skilled areas. White-collar jobs hold this type of appeal, and it is these jobs that everyone wants! Our task is to provide jobs with a future for the minority groups, not just ordinary jobs.

We must face people *honestly*. We must instill a sense of pride in them as individuals who contribute significantly to the production of a product or a building.

Now a word about testing. Tests are a poor barometer to ascertain the abilities of the hard-core unemployed. First of all, because of their limited educational levels and the fact, which has been widely recognized, that they have lower reading ability and mathematical comprehension, a true picture is not given of the ability of the hard-core unemployed. Thus, we need to reevaluate the whole picture of testing in light of the hard-core unemployed and the disadvantaged.

One recommendation would be to have the hard-core unemployed compete directly on the job with those persons who have been tested; this may measure in some way the validity of the tests.

Consistent with the AFL-CIO policy in which we ask that the federal government become the employer of last resort, we feel this is a necessary step because of the types of problems which are unique to the disadvantaged and hard-core unemployed. The federal government must finance programs to insure that they get the proper health services in addition to job training necessary for them to compete in the world of work.

In this regard, it would also be necessary for management to retrain possibly every foreman, every personnel director in the area of human relations and in the special problems of the hard core and disadvantaged, to be able to deal with them effectively.

In conclusion, we need to provide meaningful jobs to the disadvantaged. We have to see that the unemployed, underemployed and unskilled Negroes will receive more on-the-job training. There is no institution or agency without fault for not dealing adequately with the problems of training the hard core. The educational system, the state employment service, both government and management together must make every effort to insure meaningful job occupations for the hard-core unemployed. It must be done on a massive scale, not company by company or agency by agency, but by massive efforts by all institutions in the country.

Workshop 5

AREA SCHOOLS AND FEDERAL PROGRAMS

Remarks by Workshop Moderator Duane Thompson
Program Director
Center for Labor and Management
The University of Iowa

Consistent with the theme of this conference, this workshop on "Area Schools and Federal Programs" concentrated on the dissemination of information on training and education programs conducted both by the federal government and the state of Iowa.

It seems implausible that, with the advent of large government commitments and the accessibility of these programs to business and labor, there is a lack of understanding not only of the details of the programs but even of the basic objectives they are designed to meet. This unawareness is probably due to the following factors, namely: (1) these programs are relatively new, (2) the multiplicity of programs creates problems as to the specific nature of each and complicates knowledge of the relationship between programs, and (3) the commitment by government has encroached on an area that previously was reserved to and protected by private industry.

The involvement of the federal government in education has undergone a dramatic transition during the past fifteen years. To look at only one measure of this transformation, federal dollars spent in 1952-1953 for all education totaled something in excess of 1.4 million dollars, and of this more than half was spent on the education of veterans. The magnitude of the change becomes apparent when this figure is cast against an approximate 8.4 million expended on education by the federal government in 1966-1967.

Examination of the dollar increase tells only part of the story, however. One must also examine the increased scope of federal support. This increase is reflected by a review of legislation since 1958. Some of the more important federal laws influencing the increased magnitude and scope of federal involvement are: The National Defense Education Act of 1958, Manpower Development and Training Act of 1962, Higher Education Facilities Act of 1963, Vocational Education Act of 1963, The Economic Opportunity Act of 1964, and The Elementary and Secondary Education Act of 1965. As further evidence of the diversity of federally sponsored assistance to education, the U.S. Office of Education (only one of several federal offices administering educational programs) in February of this year published a list of 111 programs which the office administered.

John Ropes, one of the panelists, specifically reviewed the more important federal government training programs. Mr. Ropes is Director of the Iowa Manpower Development Council and also is Director of the State Office of Economic Opportunity. Mr. Ropes clearly defined the objectives and goals of such government training programs as Job Corps, Neighborhood Youth Corps, Adult Basic Education Program, and Manpower Development and Training Programs.

He specifically pointed out the need for the cooperation of private industry to employ people who are involved in these training programs, and he mentioned the continuing problem of clarifying to the public the nature of these programs.

Of particular concern to the state of Iowa is the federal government's involvement in vocational education programs. Of the 8.4-billion dollars expended on education by the federal government in 1967, it is estimated that 1.3-billion dollars were spent on vocational education, work training, and other adult or continuing education programs—nearly as much as was spent on all federal education programs in 1953. Iowa, along with other states, shares in this aid to education.

Mr. Windol Wyatt, the other panelist, who is Associate Superintendent of the State Department of Public Instruction, explained to the workshop the details of the 1965 law which provided for the establishment and operation of area vocational schools and area community colleges in Iowa. To date, fifteen areas have schools in operation—eleven having both vocational curricula and the first two years of college work, the other four operating as vocational schools. These programs provide, in addition to the above-mentioned college work and vocational and technical education, assistance to high school age students, high school completion programs, retraining programs, and rehabilitation programs.

Because of the recent development of these schools, their impact is just beginning to be felt, but their potential is also limitless, especially as Mr. Wyatt points out when one realizes that 80 per cent of the students in Iowa are potential students in need of vocational and occupational education.

The discussion period after the workshop raised questions on the relationship between the state-operated education programs and those conducted by both Good Will Industries and programs assisting inmates of correctional institutions. Discussants were particularly concerned with the competition over limited resources. One of the real concerns of the panelists was how to assist employers to project forward their training needs so that programs developed would be timely and not based on outdated information. One of the major problems is that employers rarely project beyond six months, and this shortsightedness limits effectiveness of vocational and technical programs.

Current training results indicate that approximately 75 per cent of the people receiving vocational/technical training are placed in employment. The record is not clear, however, as to how long they are employed in their first occupation. But considering the characteristics of the people involved in training, even if half of the 75 per cent retained jobs in their particular skills it would be an achievement.

This workshop, and particularly the discussion period, pointed out without any question the need for coordination and communication between government officials, both on the state and federal levels, with employers and trade unions. Closer cooperation is needed between these groups if we are to correctly identify training needs and get the best possible results from our efforts.

Paper presented by
Windol Wyatt
Director, Division of Vocational Education
Department of Public Instruction
Des Moines

For the past few decades technological advances in society have promised only one thing for certain—*that is change*. A look toward the future focuses attention on the fact that change is a keynote in interpreting the demands of the Space Age in terms of the educational training needs for tomorrow. The changing manpower needs of industry call for a long-range look at the work force of the future —for changing industrial patterns signal a change in vocational and technical education programs.

Iowa is making every effort possible to meet this challenge of the future by implementing extensive vocational and technical education programs throughout the state.

Vocational education first came into its own in 1905 after Governor Douglass of Massachusetts established a committee for the study of the needs of vocational education in that state. The findings of the committee were conclusive—in that they pointed out the acute need for vocational training. The results of the Douglass Commission laid the groundwork for the eventual passage of the Smith-Hughes Act in 1917. The Smith-Hughes Act made federal monies available to the states for teaching vocational education on the secondary and post-secondary levels.

Vocational and technical education are programs which are designed to fit individuals for employment in a recognized occupation or cluster of occupations. The instruction in such programs will include vocational or technical training or retraining for those preparing to enter a recognized occupation upon the completion of instruction and training. Instruction is also provided for those who have already entered an occupation, but desire to upgrade or update their occupational skills and knowledge in order to achieve stability or advancement in employment.

However, it is necessary to differentiate between the terms *vocational education* and *technical education* as they are used here.

> *Vocational Education* refers to the development of skills, abilities, understandings, attitudes, work habits, and appreciations encompassing knowledge and information needed by workers to enter and make progress in employment on a useful, gainful and productive basis.

whereas:

> *Technical Education* refers to the preparation of people for gainful employment in an occupation in which success is dependent largely upon technical information and understanding of the laws of science and their practical application to modern design, production, and services.

As the worker progresses from the semiskilled worker classification toward the engineer level, his job performed requires less manipulative skill and more technical knowledge. This is the criteria which in varying degrees differentiates between a technical and vocational program.

The 61st General Assembly in 1965 passed Senate File 550 which provided for the establishment and operation of area vocational schools and area community colleges in Iowa. To date, fifteen merged areas have been approved by the State Board of Public Instruction for the operation of area community colleges and area vocational schools.

Of the fifteen approved areas, eleven have been designated as area community colleges offering both vocational curricula and the first two years of college work. Four areas have been approved as vocational schools.

With the exception of seven counties, the entire state is included in the network of approved areas. These counties are still involved in the planning and development of a proposal and will undoubtedly either form their own area or join with an existing area in the near future.

It was stipulated in Senate File 550, which is the legal framework for the creation of area schools, that each merged area must be made up of two or more counties. In addition to this requirement, it was also necessary that each proposed merged area have no less than 4,000 students enrolled in high school at the time of the proposal.

These are only a few of the considerations and requirements which had to be met before the State Board could give final approval. In brief, the State Board also considered the geographic limits, population projections, educational needs and offerings, proposed curricula, and assessed valuation and local interest.

The area schools are financed by means of local, state, and federal funds. The federal funds are made available through the 1963 Vocational Education Act.

Senate File 550 also provided that three-fourths of one mill can be levied in the local merged districts for operating costs. The law also permits the local area districts to levy three-fourths of one mill for capital improvements, such as buildings and land, if it meets with the approval of 50 per cent of the voters in the merged area.

In addition to local levies, tuition can be assessed by the local merged district as long as it does not exceed the semester tuition rate charged by the lowest-cost regency institution. This year that institution is the University of Northern Iowa at Cedar Falls. This tuition is paid by the individual student enrolled.

The tuition rate of the area schools ranged from $100 to $150 per semester for instate students in 1967-1968. This figure rose to $150 to $175 in the 1968-1969 school year. Approximately half of the schools are on a semester basis; the other half operate on a quarterly basis. The quarterly tuitions range from $50 to $70 in 1967-1968 for instate students. The maximum charged was $100 per quarter in 1968-1969, although several areas remained at $50 per quarter.

The specific purposes for the creation of each merged area were to offer to the residents of Iowa a new dimension in educational opportunities and services. The specific purposes would be:

1. The first two years of college work including preprofessional education.
2. Vocational and technical education.

3. Programs for inservice training and retraining of workers.
4. Programs for high school completion for students of post-high school age.
5. Programs for all students of high school age who may best serve themselves by enrolling for vocational and technical training while also enrolled in a local high school, private or public.
6. Student personnel services.
7. Community services.
8. Vocational education for persons who have academic, socioeconomic, or other handicaps which prevent succeeding in regular vocational education programs.
9. Training, retraining, and all necessary preparation for productive employment of all citizens.

The area school concept has gained great momentum since its conception in 1965. The curricula offered are being developed on a continual basis. It is now nearing the point where all persons of all ages in all communities can obtain training suited to their abilities and interest and *can* and *are* benefitting from this training.

Manpower surveys are being conducted throughout the state to determine what job classifications need trained employees, at the present time and in the future. The findings of these manpower needs surveys are the backbone for the establishment of courses and programs. After the definite needs for training programs have been ascertained, advisory committees from the specific industries involved are utilized to help develop the best curricula possible to meet the present and future needs of industry for trained personnel.

It is this cooperation between industry and education which will make it possible for Iowa to develop a superior educational system for the good of all Iowans.

The surveys are being conducted to gather such information as:

1. Number of employees currently in specific occupations.
2. Current and anticipated job openings in specific occupations.
3. Replacement needs in specific occupations.
4. Upgrading and retraining needs in specific occupations.
5. Emerging nonprofessional and subprofessional occupations.
6. Current training effort within the various industries to meet training needs for specific occupations.
7. Current training effort within private schools to meet training needs for specific occupations.

The area school concept is meeting a vital need for vocational and technical education. An examination of the educational statistics in Iowa reveals that of every ten youngsters in the grade schools today only seven will receive a high school diploma. Of these seven, four will continue their education and three will go to work, some of them as wives and mothers. Of the four continuing on to college, only half will complete four years of college.

In other words, 80 per cent of the students in Iowa are persons who are potential students in need of vocational and occupational education. In addition to the younger generation, there are large numbers of adults in need of training and retraining to become qualified for jobs in today's and tomorrow's world of work.

The enrollments in post-secondary vocational and technical programs have been increasing steadily for the past number of years. The enrollment for the past year, 1967, showed a total of 2,634 students in post-high school preparatory work and 44,185 in adult education programs. The ratio of males to females was approximately two to one in post-high school work and four to one in adult education programs.

In conclusion, we feel that we must agree that never before has there been an educational innovation which can and has provided so much for so many. It must be kept in mind that the area school concept is in its infancy and the potential is unlimited.

Paper presented by
John Ropes
Director, Iowa State Manpower Commission
Des Moines

There are, in all probability, by a conservative estimate at least several dozen different human resource development programs entirely or substantially financed by the federal government.

These programs range from day-care centers for infants, Headstart programs for children, training and work experience programs for youth and adults to retraining, income supplement and retirement programs for senior citizens. While I would admit that such an array of programs, at first blush, sounds like very paternalistic government, a closer examination of the purpose and intent of each program reveals that, through democratic processes, we have attempted to remedy inequalities that are inherent, or become evident, in a rapidly changing social system. Long-accepted and cherished social institutions are undergoing change—and the rate of change is accelerating with each new scientific finding and technological breakthrough.

Such occurrences, completely beyond the control of the individual, have a profound effect upon the lives of thousands of people.

We are living in an age where life's activities can be likened to a horse race. We either get off to a good start, pick up speed at the halfway point and cross the finish line with sufficient momentum to carry us several lengths into comfortable retirement, or we are left at the gate, crowded out on the backstretch, and stumble and fall at the finish line. The major, but very important difference in the analogy is the fact that we run only one race in a lifetime.

Human resource (or manpower) development programs merely introduce the the handicap factor into such a race by equalizing the opportunity for many persons to: get a better start in life; acquire saleable skills for employment; earn, provide and save; and finally enjoy the fruits of their labor in retirement.

Such programs have been of immeasurable value to the private business sector. Thousands of persons have been equipped to enter or reenter the labor force. They represent a tremendous potential to fill the manpower needs of our state's expanding business community.

Time will not permit me to do much more than mention a dozen or so such programs and elaborate on a few of the more significant ones. Some of the programs for youth are: (1) the Job Corps, (2) the Neighborhood Youth Corps, (3) Vocational Work-Study Programs. Programs for both youth and adults are: (1) Adult Basic Education, (2) Vocational and Technical Education, (3) Manpower Development and Training Programs, which have two components (a) Institutional Training and (b) On-the-Job Training, and educational and developmental programs to stimulate new ideas and approaches to manpower problems, (4) national apprenticeship training programs, (5) Vocational Rehabilitation Training Services, (for handicapped), (6) special impact programs. Programs for adults are: (1) Work Incentive Programs, (2) New Careers Programs, (3) Operation Mainstream.

Let me quickly recite a few of the features of some of these programs and state at this point that I am not necessarily an expert on all of them.

Job Corps. This is an institutional program to prepare young men and women, aged 16 to 21, to be responsible citizens, increase their skills, and enhance their employability.

Trainees receive general education and specific vocational instruction in a residential setting. Youths who complete training constitute a valuable resource that business and industry should explore and utilize. Hundreds of Iowa youth have been sent to the centers, and I recommend we aggressively recruit them back to Iowa so that we may benefit from our investment in them and their investment in themselves. Let me suggest that a visit to the Job Corps Centers in Clinton, Iowa, Omaha and Chadron, Nebraska, would be a most worthwhile experience.

Neighborhood Youth Corps. This is a program to foster better work habits, provide income, counseling, and remedial education for youngsters 14 through 21 years of age.

Commonly referred to as NYC, the program serves inschool youth during the school year, out-of-school youth on a year-around basis, and summer programs for those returning to school.

Work stations for NYC enrollees are with public agencies where training is given in a wide variety of fields, including office aides, auto mechanic aides, draftsmen aides, hospital aides, and many, many others.

Special benefits to youth participants include: (1) personal and vocational counseling, (2) remedial education, (3) work motivation, (4) consumer education.

The NYC program has had a most favorable effect upon the school dropout problem. Studies completed and underway indicate that the inschool program provides often-needed income that makes the difference between remaining in school or dropping out.

Some enrollees are sent on to manpower training programs by the Employment Service, others enter the Job Corps, military service, and of course, many are ready for immediate entry into the labor force. I would highly recommend to personnel directors who may be present here today to contact your local NYC director—or Community Action Agency—for further details on this program. Iowa has such programs established in every CAA with almost statewide coverage.

Adult Basic Education. This is a program for persons over 18 years of age, who, because of basic educational deficiencies, are unemployed or underemployed.

Primarily the program is aimed at persons whose basic language and arithmetic skills are below the normal fifth-grade level. Second priority is given to instruction above the fifth-grade through the eighth-grade level.

Needless to say, these skills must be achieved before further technical or vocational training is given. Basic Education programs therefore are often preliminary to specific manpower vocational training programs.

Many persons presently employed but working far below potential productivity could benefit from this program if impeded by severe educational deficiencies. Perhaps you are aware of just that person and if so I suggest you contact your local public school or area community college for information on programs in your vicinity.

Manpower Development and Training. This is a program to train youth and adults in a wide variety of technical and vocational occupations.

1. To meet the needs of disadvantaged, underskilled persons seeking employment.

2. To upgrade the skills of underemployed persons or retrain persons whose jobs are threatened by automation.

3. To meet the needs of industry (employers) in many fields where there is a shortage of skilled workers.

Two separate programs are administered under the Act, Institutional (classroom) Training and On-the-Job Training. However, in some instances institutional programs are coupled with or tacked on to On-the-Job Training to provide a formal and practical training curriculum.

Institutional programs are jointly administered in Iowa by the State Employment Service and the State Department of Public Instruction; On-the-Job Training (until further decisions are reached) by the Bureau of Work and Training Programs and the Iowa Manpower Development Council.

Certainly all employers in Iowa should familiarize themselves with these programs as they constitute a tremendous resource to our state's skilled labor force. Further information can be obtained from your local Employment Service office or the Iowa Manpower Development Council.

Programs for Adults. These are the Work Incentive Programs, the New Careers Program and Operation Mainstream, primarily federally funded public works programs that provide work-experience with some form of training. The latter component includes counseling, basic education, consumer education, health and medical services, and in some cases more formalized vocational instruction.

These programs are for adults 22 years of age or older who are chronically unemployed and have an annual family income below the poverty guideline.

The short-run objective of all three programs is to provide income maintenance and, at the same time, valuable work experience that will have a carry-over value in private employment. The long-term objective is, of course, to qualify these persons for entry or reentry into the labor force—hopefully in jobs with private employers.

While it is conceded that persons enrolled in these programs represent the real "hard-core disadvantaged" so often referred to today, the success or failure of such efforts will ultimately be determined by the private business sector's willingness to employ these persons when they are ready to leave the program.

The most difficult problem we, the administrators of federal programs, encounter is the lack of public understanding and acceptance of human restoration programs. The paradox of living in an "era" of high employment and affluency while welfare rolls grow and poverty intensifies is beyond the understanding and comprehension of many Americans. The point not generally realized is that our *growing affluency increases the problems of our less fortunate citizens* in that they become more aware, and certainly more resentful, of social and economic factors that "impinge" upon their lives and "diminish" their opportunity to compete in a highly "materialistic" society.

Congress has only attempted to provide programs that will equalize opportunity for such persons. Work and training programs are primarily intended to equip unemployed or underemployed persons with new and desirable work habits and entry level skills to enable them to compete for jobs and have something to "sell" a prospective employer.

Each component (such as Neighborhood Youth Corps, Work Incentive Programs, Adult Basic Education, etc.) was designed to meet the need of a specific segment of the target population. Admittedly there have been problems in coordinating the services of the several agencies administering these programs. However, this flaw is rapidly being remedied through the Cooperative Area Manpower Planning System (CAMPS) that brings together all agencies dealing with human resource development. We are very optimistic that a comprehensive coordinated plan will evolve from this effort that will greatly improve the delivery of services to persons in need.

In conclusion, let me comment on the important role of the private business sector and organized labor can play in perfecting the federal work and training programs. It obviously would be an exercise in futility to prepare people for entry into the labor force if there isn't a place for them. We need your cooperation in telling us (the administrators of federal programs) what the needs of industry are, where we should place our emphasis, where the programs are lacking or deficient, and finally your acceptance of the products.

Federal work and training programs can make a meaningful contribution toward solving Iowa's critical manpower shortage—and at the same time effectively reduce the incidence of poverty in our state, making it a more desirable place for all of us to live.

PUBLICATIONS
# of the
Center for Labor and Management

MONOGRAPH SERIES

*1. *Iowa Employment Patterns and Projections, 1940-1970,* Mario Frank Bognanno, 1966. $1.00.

2. *The Art of Time Study: An Exercise in Personal Judgment,* Bertram Gottlieb, October, 1966. $.50.
3. *Job Enlargement,* Paul Stewart, January, 1967. $1.00.
4. *Selection and Training, A Survey of Iowa Manufacturing Firms,* Editors—Don R. Sheriff, Duane E. Thompson, Robert W. Parks, December, 1966. $1.00.
5. *Preemption, Predictability and Progress in Labor Law,* Clarence M. Updegraff, February, 1967. $.50.
6. *Annotated Bibliography of Federal Government Publications Presenting Data About Organizations,* James L. Price, March, 1967. $1.00.
7. *Free Speech Rights Under the Labor Management Relations Act,* Walter L. Daykin, Anthony V. Sinicropi, Michael W. Whitehill, June, 1967. $1.00.
8. *The Iowa Law of Workmen's Compensation,* Clifford Davis, Willard L. Boyd, Harry W. Dahl, Wilbur N. Bump, Russell J. Weintraub, July, 1967. $1.50.
9. *Iowa Labor Laws,* Anthony V. Sinicropi, Revised, September, 1967. $1.00.
10. *Student Perceptions of Causes of Labor-Management Conflict,* John W. Lloyd, May, 1968. $1.00.
11. *Centralized Versus Decentralized Decision-Making in Collective Bargaining: Effects on Substantive Contract Language,* Michael Whitehill, August, 1968. $1.00.
12. *Manpower Developments: Problems and Prospects,* Edgar R. Czarnecki, October, 1968. $1.00.

REPRINT SERIES

*1. *Legalized Concerted Activity Under the Taft-Hartley Act,* Walter L. Daykin. Reprinted from Labor Law Journal, 1952.

2. *Union Security—Federal or State Sphere,* Chester A. Morgan. Reprinted from Labor Law Journal, 1953. Free.
3. *Furnishing Wage Data for Bargaining,* Walter L. Daykin. Reprinted from Labor Law Journal, 1953. Free.
4. *Effect of NLRA and Taft-Hartley on the Employer's Right to Hire,* Walter L. Daykin. Reprinted from Labor Law Journal, 1953. Free.

5. *Preparation for Arbitration and Hearing Procedure,* Clarence M. Updegraff. Reprinted from Labor Arbitration, 1954. Free.
*6. *Unions and State Antitrust Laws,* Chester A. Morgan. Reprinted from Labor Law Journal, 1956.
*7. *Iowa Labor Laws,* Thomas W. Stewart. Reprinted from Bureau of Labor and Management Research Series No. 3, 1957.
*8. *Arbitration of Job Evaluation Disputes,* Clifford M. Baumback. Reprinted from Bureau of Labor and Management Research Series No. 8, 1957.
*9. *Legality of Lockouts Under the Taft-Hartley Act,* Walter L. Daykin. Reprinted from Labor Law Journal, 1958.
*10. *Union Fees and Dues,* Walter L. Daykin. Reprinted from Labor Law Journal, 1958.
*11. *Adequacy of Medical Benefits in Collectively Bargained Health Insurance Plans—Recent and Future Research,* Fred Slavick. Reprinted from Proceedings of the Tenth Annual Meeting, Industrial Relations Research Association, September 5-7, 1957.
*12. *A Primer on Engineering Unionism,* Jack F. Culley. Reprinted from Iowa Business Digest, Fall Quarterly, 1958.
*13. *Legal Issues in Labor Relations,* Walter L. Daykin. A collection of articles reprinted from various business and professional journals, 1961.
*14. *Union Security, Hiring Halls, Right-to-Work Laws and the Supreme Court,* Irving Kovarsky. Reprinted from Labor Law Journal, 1964.
15. *University Sponsored Executive Development Programs: Three Controllable Variables,* Don R. Sheriff and Jude P. West. Reprinted from the Personnel Administrator, November-December, 1964. Free.
16. *Apprentice Training Programs and Racial Discrimination,* Irving Kovarsky. Reprinted from the Iowa Law Review, Spring, 1965. Free.
17. *The Labor Movement and Social Change,* Michael Harrington. The First Eugene V. Debs Lecture before the Midwest Labor Press Association, 1967. $.25.
18. *Guidelines for Arbitration Witnesses,* Clarence M. Updegraff, 1963. Free.
19. *Worker Education in Denmark,* Robert E. Belding, 1968. $.25.
20. *Leadership Skills and Executive Development,* Don R. Sheriff. Reprinted from Training and Development Journal, Vol. 22, No. 4, 1968. Free.
21. *Unions and Federal Elections—A Social and Legal Analysis,* Irving Kovarsky. Reprinted from Saint Louis University *Law Journal,* Vol. 12, No. 3, Spring, 1968. $.25.
22. *Leadership and Group Decisions Involving Risk,* George C. Hoyt and

James A. F. Stoner. Reprinted from *Social Psychology,* Vol. 4, No. 3, July 1968. Free.

CONFERENCE SERIES

- *1. *Effective Safety Programs,* 1952.
- *2. *The Changing Pattern of Labor-Management Relations and the Impact of Labor-Management Relations on the Town and City,* 1953.
- *3. *Proceedings of the Session on Arbitration at the State University of Iowa,* 1953.
- *4. *Development of the Individual in Business and Industry,* 1956.
- 5. *Contemporary Values and the Responsibility of the College,* Editor, Jack F. Culley, 1962. $1.00.
- 6. *The Problem Drinker in Industry,* Editor, Don R. Sheriff, 1962. $1.00.
- *7. *Industrial Survival,* Editors, Don R. Sheriff and Craig Lloyd, 1963.
- *8. *Employment Problems of Working Women,* Editors, John J. Flagler, Mario F. Bognanno, and Craig Lloyd, 1963.
- 9. *The Social and Technological Revolution of the Sixties,* Editors, Don R. Sheriff, David Zaehringer, and Craig Lloyd, 1965. $1.00.
- 10. *The New Perspectives in Collective Bargaining,* Editors, Don R. Sheriff, Sandra Hoffman, and Kathleen McCaffrey, 1966. $1.00.
- 11. *NLRB in a Changing Industrial Society,* Editors, Don R. Sheriff and Viola M. Kuebler, 1967. $1.00.
- 12. *Manpower Developments: Problems and Prospects,* Edgar R. Czarnecki, October, 1968. $1.00.

OTHER PUBLICATIONS

Educational Films for Labor and Management, 1965. Free.

*OUT OF PRINT (All publications out of print are available to individuals on a loan basis.)

Single copies of the publications are furnished without charge to universities and to other educational institutions. Bulk rates will be given upon request. Address requests to:

Center for Labor and Management
College of Business Administration
The University of Iowa
Phillips Hall
Iowa City, Iowa 52240